

# *The* HISTORICAL BULLETIN

Vol. XXVII

JANUARY, 1949

No. 2

---

## THE CHRISTIAN DEMOCRAT PARTIES

Anthony T. Bouscaren

## THEORIES OF CHURCH-STATE RELATIONSHIPS IN SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND

Clarence J. Ryan

## THE SIEGE OF YORKTOWN

Charles G. Wilber

## BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

---

Saint Louis University

50 cents a copy

Saint Louis 3, Mo.

\$2.00 a Year



# The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A SERVICE QUARTERLY  
for Teachers and Students of History

Vol. XXVII

JANUARY, 1949

No. 2

## Editor

JOHN FRANCIS BANNON

## Editorial Board

THOMAS L. COONAN  
JASPER W. CROSS  
ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI  
JOSEPH P. DONNELLY

LAURENCE J. KENNY  
THOMAS P. NEILL  
PAUL G. STEINBICKER  
HERBERT WEINSCHL

Published quarterly in November, January, March, and May, by the Department of History, Saint Louis University, Saint Louis 3, Missouri. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932, at the Post Office of Saint Louis, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Address all communications to THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN, 221 North Grand Blvd., Saint Louis 3, Missouri. THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN is indexed in the CATHOLIC BOOKMAN and THE CATHOLIC PERIODICAL INDEX.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE CHRISTIAN DEMOCRAT PARTIES . . . . .	27
<i>Anthony T. Bouscaren</i>	
THEORIES OF CHURCH-STATE RELATIONSHIPS IN SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND . . . . .	29
<i>Clarence J. Ryan</i>	
THE SIEGE OF YORKTOWN . . . . .	31
<i>Charles G. Wilber</i>	
BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES . . . . .	41

## CONTRIBUTORS

ANTHONY T. BOUSCAREN, A.B., is instructor in political science, University of San Francisco. This present article is the summary of several chapters of a fuller treatment which the author is preparing currently.

CLARENCE J. RYAN, S.J., A.M., Ph.D., is associate professor of history, Marquette University. His graduate dissertation and subsequent research have given him wide acquaintance with the English seventeenth century.

CHARLES G. WILBER, A.M., Ph.D., is assistant professor of physiology, Fordham University. His hobby is military history.



# The Christian Democrat Parties

Anthony T. Bouscaren

University of San Francisco

ONE of the most remarkable developments in Western Europe since the end of World War II has been the rise to power of a comparatively new political force: Christian Democracy. Parties based on its principles have emerged from the chaos of the war years to challenge, and in most cases to surpass the old Liberal, Socialist, and Communist parties.

In Italy the Christian Democrats polled 49% of the popular vote in the national elections of April 1948, and have an absolute majority in the Chamber of Deputies. The De Gasperi Government contains eleven Christian Democrats in a cabinet of twenty-two.<sup>1</sup> In France the Mouvement Républicain Populaire polled 26% of the vote in the November 1946 national elections, to make it the second largest party in the National Assembly, although the municipal elections of November 1947 and the elections to the Council of the Republic of October-November 1948 seem to have considerably reduced its popular backing, due in part to the rise of De Gaullism. The Queuille Government of thirty-one ministers includes nine Popular Republicans.<sup>2</sup> German local, provincial, and state elections during 1946 gave the Christian Democratic Union 48% of the vote in the American zone, 37% in the British zone, and 56% in the French zone. The CDU dominates the lower house of Bizonia, and together with the Socialists, shares the brunt of drafting the constitution for the new Germany.<sup>3</sup> In Austria, the elections of November 1945 gave the People's Party 50% of the vote and an absolute majority of mandates in the legislature. The Figl Government of seventeen contains seven Populists, including the Chancellor, Foreign Minister, and the Minister of the Interior.<sup>4</sup> In Belgium, the Parti Social Chrétien won 46% of the vote in the national elections of February 1946 to make it the strongest party in the lower house. The Spaak Government of nineteen includes nine Social

Christians.<sup>5</sup> The national elections of July 1948 in the Netherlands gave the Catholic People's Party 31% of the vote, and it thus continued to be the largest party in the lower chamber. The Drees Government of thirteen has six ministers from the People's Party.<sup>6</sup>

The nucleus of all these parties existed before the war, but the post-war Christian Democrat parties differ from their pre-war next-of-kin in several important respects. The post-war parties, which are made up for the most part of younger men, who played important roles in the various resistance movements,<sup>7</sup> are non-denominational, and genuinely democratic. In collaboration with Socialists and other constitutional parties, they are playing an important role in preserving law-limited government in Western Europe, in extending economic well-being, and in preserving the peace in collaboration with the Atlantic community of nations. The Christian Democrat parties have a social and political heterogeneity which distinguishes them from the Liberal, Socialist and Communist political groupings; they are the only political parties in continental Europe which are similar to American major parties, in that they cut across the great interest groupings of the population.<sup>8</sup>

Unfortunately there is in the United States especially a general lack of knowledge and understanding of this new political force which is playing such an important role not only within states but in the relations between states. Christian Democracy has been variously termed conservative, socialistic, or political Catholicism. Many students of political science and history appear over-ready to accept one of these labels without scientific investigation, while at the same time insisting upon such investigation before reaching conclusions in regard to the other European political forces of Liberalism, Socialism and Communism.

What then is Christian Democracy? In brief, it is a political movement based on the compatibility be-

<sup>1</sup> For election see *New York Times*, April 22, 1948; for cabinet see *ibid.*, June 5, 1948.

<sup>2</sup> Two of whom resigned on Nov. 8, 1948, upon failing to be re-elected to the council of the Republic. For June 1946 national election see *Le Figaro*, June 2, 1946; *New York Times*, June 4, 1946. For Nov. 1947 municipal elections see *News from France* (French Embassy Information Service), Oct. 30, 1947; *World Today* (R. I. I. A.), Dec. 1947, pp. 529-536.

<sup>3</sup> For the 1946 elections see *Occupation of Germany*, State Dept. Publication No. 2783, p. 56; also J. Pollock, *Change and Crisis in European Government* (New York: Rinehart, 1947), p. 158. For Bonn Constitution efforts: *New York Times*, June 8, July 7, Aug. 29, Sept. 6, Oct. 13, 1948.

<sup>4</sup> *New York Times*, Nov. 26, 1945; *Tablet* (London), Sept. 29, 1945.

<sup>5</sup> For elections see *Le Soir* (Brussels), Feb. 25, 1946; W. N. Mallory, *Political Handbook of the World* (New York: Harper Bros., 1947), p. 10.

<sup>6</sup> *New York Times*, July 9, 1948; *Chicago Tribune*, Aug. 9, 1948.

<sup>7</sup> Notably De Gasperi and Vuillermin in Italy, Bidault, de Menthon and Teitgen in France, Kaiser, Hermes, and Jos. Muller in Germany, Deschuyffaleir, Behogne, and Segers in Belgium, Thyssen in the Netherlands, and Figl and Gruber in Austria.

<sup>8</sup> See Gabriel A. Almond, "The Christian Parties," *World Politics* (Yale), Oct. 1948, esp. p. 36 in which occupations of deputies of three leading French parties are charted. Similar chart in *A Constitution for the Fourth French Republic* (Foundation for National Affairs pamphlet No. 2, 1947), p. 82.



tween Christianity and Democracy, which seeks to apply new techniques to social and economic problems within the framework of constitutional, law-limited government. The Christian Democrat believes that the only firm anchor of Democracy is found in natural law concepts such as are stated in the American Declaration of Independence and in bills of rights the world over, and that Democracy, to avoid becoming associated with either laissez-faire Capitalism or Socialism, which deny or ignore man's moral nature, must be Christian, with the idea that man is created by God and that society is determined by Nature.<sup>9</sup> The Christian Democrat therefore rejects Hegelian idealism and Comtian positivism, Marxist historical materialism, agnostic pragmatism and historical relativism, all of which have sought to replace the moral code with a political absolute. This search by a secular society, influenced by Rousseau's collective will and Hegel's ideal state, led to the totalitarian Communist and Fascist states. Gentile and Maurras found the absolute in the State and Nation, respectively; Lenin and Stalin found it in the Class, and Fichte and Hitler found it in the Race.<sup>10</sup> The Christian concept of the dignity and worth of man is denounced by all totalitarians, who rightly link it with democracy. "The democratic concept of man is false because it is Christian. The democratic concept holds that . . . each man is a sovereign being. This is the dream and postulate of Christianity".<sup>11</sup> These words of Karl Marx were in part echoed by Adolf Hitler who once declared: "To the Christian concept of the infinite significance of the individual soul . . . I oppose with icy clarity the saving doctrine of the nothingness and insignificance of the human being".<sup>12</sup>

The revaluation of the rights of the person, not only in the natural but also in the historico-Christian sense, has, in the face of State-worship tendencies and totalitarianism, been a step forward in human accomplishment, and a positive affirmation of Democracy vis à vis Hegel, Comte, Marx and their modern followers.

The Christian Democrat further believes that Democracy is government by and for the people; that it must include political freedoms of speech, press, assembly and vote, admitting that such liberties must be actuated with proper regulations so as not to become through abuse dangerous to society itself; that modern Democracy cannot exist without parliaments, and must preserve the distinction between the state powers: the legislative, executive and judicial; that true Democracy must be based on social justice which avoids economic exploitation of certain classes and gives to all the opportunity for well-being and betterment. Furthermore, he is convinced that modern Democracy is the fruit of Christian civilization. Because Christian Democracy gives prevailing value to morality in public

life, it was natural that it should found itself on the Judaeo-Christian tradition of thought which is the historic and ideological basis of modern civilization.

Christian Democrats stress that they are not a "Church Party", and that they appeal to all men of good will who accept their political program. Especially in Germany are the ranks of the Christian Democratic Union filled with people of all faiths. In Europe the value of religion itself has often been made a political issue, and there have been many political groupings whose sole unifying force was their anti-religious character. In view of this situation, it has been necessary for men of religious convictions to band together in the political arena to defend the spiritual freedom of man. The Christian Democrat parties carry on that fight at the same time that they propose a progressive social and economic program to bring justice for the poor and the depressed.

The main stress of most Christian Democrat programs is upon the need of reintegrating the laboring man into society by making him a responsible partner in the economic process of which he is part. The Industry Council Plan is Christian Democracy's principal technique for establishing genuine economic democracy, in order to raise labor to a partnership with capital, and to eliminate economic autocracy.<sup>13</sup> Often called economic federalism, the Plan envisages the decentralization of economic life to the extent of each industry laying down the rules and regulations for its operation, subject always to a supervisory power of coordination by the state. Within each council a large measure of self-government would prevail. The furtherance of administrative decentralization and of local autonomies (the family, county, region, university, trade union, etc.), should be accomplished in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity: tasks which can be efficiently performed by a smaller, particular body, should not be transferred to a larger and general one. A National Economic Council should be created, representing labor and management, to assist the national parliament in drafting legislation for industry. The Industry Council Plan is not to be confused with the Fascist corporate system, which has been described by Luigi Sturzo, often called the "elder statesman" of Christian Democracy, as "one of conservative reaction."<sup>14</sup> Mussolini distorted the corporate idea to serve purely political aims, and mixed into it his Syndicalist theory; he made it a scheme by which more sections of the community could be brought under the control of the Fascist Party. The Industry Council Plan contemplates a citizenry able to bear the burdens which a democratic order presupposes. Initiative, self-control, and respect for law would be essential. This Christian Democrat economic plan has found expression in Belgium and is being legislated upon in the Netherlands. A National Economic Council, councils for each indus-

<sup>9</sup> See Heinrich Rommen, *The Natural Law* (New York: Herder, 1947).

<sup>10</sup> For a good discussion of this see Luigi Sturzo, "The Philosophic Background of Christian Democracy," *Review of Politics*, 9 (Jan. 1947).

<sup>11</sup> Karl Marx, *Das Kapital*, 1st ed. Me. I, 1, p. 50, as quoted by J. Keller, *Insist on This* (New York: Christophers, 1947), p. 10.

<sup>12</sup> Herman Rauschnigg, *Voice of Destruction*, as quoted by Keller *loc. cit.*

<sup>13</sup> For the Industry Council Plan and Corporationism, see J. G. Kerwin, *Making Democracy Work* (Christian Democrat Series No. 3, N. Y.: Paulist Press, 1947); Sturzo, "Corporationism, Christian, Social, and Fascist", *Catholic World*, 145 (Sept. 1938).

<sup>14</sup> Malcolm Moos, "Luigi Sturzo, Christian Democrat," *American Political Science Review* (April 1945), p. 275.

(Please turn to page thirty-two)



# Theories of Church-State Relationships in Seventeenth Century England

Clarence J. Ryan

Marquette University

THE obvious point of departure for a discussion of the theories of Church-State relationships in seventeenth century England is to be found in the writings and speeches of King James I whose accession to the throne in 1603 inaugurated the Stuart dynasty in that country. In the mind of every student of history the name of the British Solomon is practically synonymous with the doctrine of divine right monarchy. It has frequently been observed that the political philosophy of James owed its origin as much to the unhappy experiences of his early life as to his reading of the controversial works produced by the religious wars in France. The precocious youth had been filled with chagrin as he came to realize that kingship in Scotland carried with it little power and inspired scant respect. His father had been murdered, his mother chased from the throne. Above all, the theocratic Presbyterians scoffed at the pretensions of secular authority, and their leaders boldly proclaimed the right of subjects to control and even cashier their rulers. Divine right of kings was opposed in that country, not by common law and parliamentary privilege, but by the vigorously heralded divine right of the Church. In a treatise outlining the duties of a monarch for the guidance of his son and heir King James trenchantly denounced Calvinistic preachers and teachers for their attacks upon the nobility and sacredness of his office. "I was calumniated in their sermons," ran his caustic charge, "not for any vice in me, but because I was king. For they told their flocks that kings and princes were naturally enemies to the Church. Take heed, therefore, my son, to such Puritans, very pests in the Church and the Commonwealth."

Just five years before coming to England James had formulated a fairly systematic statement of his political philosophy in a work which he labeled *The True Law of Free Monarchies*. Appealing principally to Scripture—or, at least, his interpretation of recorded revelation—the royal pedant maintains that the ruler is above the people and above the law, being accountable only to God and his conscience. Since kings are "not only God's lieutenants on earth, and sit upon God's throne, but even by God himself they are called gods," it is of the essence of free monarchy that it should have supreme legal power over all its subjects. It is admitted that a good king will frame all his actions in accordance with the civil law and govern in the popular interest, "yet he is not bound thereto except of his own good will and for the good example to his subjects. He is master over every person, having power over life and death." God instituted monarchy among the Jews and gave Saul authorization to act tyrannically but to

his people no right to depose or resist him. That ancient Jewish monarchy "ought to be a pattern to all Christian and well-founded monarchies."

As the successor of Elizabeth Tudor, James became supreme governor of the realm "in all spiritual and ecclesiastical things or causes as well as temporal," and every state official and ecclesiastic was obliged to acknowledge this by oath. Churchmen, for a single refusal of the oath, provided they went no further, could be punished only by loss of ecclesiastical office and emoluments. Catholics and many non-Conformists had, of course, lost all these long before the dawn of the seventeenth century. Shortly after his accession the new sovereign asserted, "That it is one of the principal parts of that duty which appertains to a Christian king, to protect the true Church within his own dominions and to extirpate heresy, is a maxim without controversy." Stuart's theory certainly was that *his* faith was the one to be defended, nor did he lose any time in broadcasting the fact. At the opening of his first parliament in 1604 he stated his stand on religious matters in unmistakable terms:

At my first coming, although I found but one religion—and that which by myself is professed—publicly allowed and by the law maintained; yet I found another sort of religion, besides a private sect, lurking in the bowels of the nation. The first is the true religion . . . The second is falsely called Catholic, but truly Papist. The third, which I call a sect rather than religion, is the Puritans or Novelists, who do not so far differ from us in points of doctrine as in their confused form of policy or parity, being ever discontented with the present government and impatient to suffer any superiority, which maketh their sect unable to be suffered in any well governed commonwealth.

While acknowledging "the Roman Church to be our Mother Church, although defiled with some infirmities and corruptions" and insisting that his mind was ever free from persecution or coercion of his subjects in matters of conscience, he swore to "tread down their errors and wrong opinions, and not to permit the increase of their religion."

Addressing parliament in 1609 James exulted, "The state of monarchy is the supremest thing on earth." And in a speech before Star Chamber a few years later he declared, "As it is atheism and blasphemy to dispute what God can do, so it is presumption and high contempt in a subject to dispute what a king can do, or to say that a king cannot do this or that."

These exalted royal claims found ready support among the Anglican clergy and in the universities. Perhaps the divines and dons were primarily motivated by utilitarian considerations as some historians of political thought are inclined to believe. At any rate, ministers of the Established Church strove mightily to bolster the King's prerogative as the most effective weapon in their truceless war against the Papacy on



one front and Puritanism on the other. Long tried by Elizabeth's pusillanimous conduct the episcopacy was only too willing to receive the royal clasp, mistaking its greedy grip for unshakable support. A generation before the throne actually tottered and crashed, many a high churchman was poignantly aware that "no king" would almost inevitably mean "no bishops."

An outstanding illustration of crozier-crown co-operation was presented in 1606 amid the hysteria that followed the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot. Not only was parliament called upon to rivet sharper teeth into the anti-Catholic penal code and to subject Papists to a much stricter oath of allegiance, but James sought to fortify his position as supreme spiritual and temporal head of the nation by procuring an episcopal pronouncement on divine right. This latter question was especially acute since the king had become embroiled in a controversy with Cardinal Bellarmine which, even in its early stages, showed unmistakable signs of enveloping Europe in the most intense and bitterly fought debate of the century. Bellarmine contended that the purpose of the oath legislation was definitely not merely to secure from English Catholics a pledge of civil loyalty, but that its aim was to "transfer the authority of the head of the Church in England from the successor of St. Peter to the successor of Henry VIII." Furthermore, argued the Cardinal in an all-out assault on the foundations of the Jacobean theory, while it is true that all political authority ultimately derives from God, it is equally true that the right possessed by a king to exercise that authority was not instituted by a divine act, but was transferred to him by the consent of the governed. In oblique reply to Bellarmine and consistently with their conclusion that "to exalt the Crown was to strengthen the Church," the clergy in Convocation proceeded to draw up an elaborate defense of the royal position as one divinely ordained. In prescribing the duty of acknowledging the king's absolute power and of rendering him passive obedience, as well as insisting that his authority comes not from the people but directly from God, these Anglican theologians of the seventeenth century far exceeded the doctrine laid down by the great Elizabethan, Richard Hooker. "Though no manner of person or cause be unsubject to the king's power," Hooker had written, "yet so is the power of the king over all and in all limited that unto all his proceedings the law itself is the rule." Strangely enough, the meticulous monarch refused to ratify Convocation's canons, the reason assigned being that he noticed a clause proclaiming the divine authority even of a *de facto* government. On this principle, he pointed out, should the King of Spain conquer England, his claim to the throne would be divinely supported, and no one might try to expel the usurper and restore the lawful ruler.

Though somewhat puzzled by the first Stuart's mercurial conduct, the clergy continued to vie with one another in emphasizing the religious aspect of kingship and the semi-divine character of the king. Bishop Lancelot Andrewes took up the controversial cudgels from James' weary hands and carried on the battle

with Bellarmine. In a court sermon, Sanderson, the favorite chaplain and Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, execrated armed resistance to a lawful sovereign for any reason whatever: "not for the maintenance of the lives and liberties of ourselves or others; not for the defense of religion; not, if that could be imagined possible, for the salvation of a soul—no, not for the redemption of the whole world."

During the reign of Charles I, churchmen in high stations repeatedly insisted that there is no jurisdiction, be it temporal or spiritual, into which the King's power does not rightfully extend. Bishop Mainwaring, for example, declared that, "Among all the powers ordained of God, the royal is the most high, strong and large. No power in the world or in the Church can lay restraint upon it. That sublime power which resides in earthly potentates is not a derivation or collection of human power, but a participation in God's own omnipotency."

Throughout the reigns of the first two Stuarts the doctrine of divine right found no supporter in the House of Commons. When James' first parliament convened it was evident that trouble was already brewing in the sphere of religion. The Puritan party within the Church of England had a strong hold upon the nation and shortly after the opening of the new reign the leading clergy of this school made an attempt to obtain from the King what Elizabeth had always denied them—a further "reformation" in doctrine and ritual. Their views were set forth in the Millenary Petition—so called because a thousand ministers were supposed to have signed it. James read the Petition with complacent sympathy and called a conference some months later at Hampton Court. Here a deputation of the Puritan clergy met the bishops and argued the question of church reform with them in the King's own presence. The ecclesiastical supremacy was deeply concerned in the controversy, and the ultimate decision rested with the theologian on the throne who took the keenest interest in the discussions. One of the Puritan disputants incautiously used the term "presbytery" and James, rich in experience of Scotland, immediately flared with rage. "If you aim at a Scottish Presbytery," he exploded, inverting in his wrath the proper order of comparison, "it agrees as well with a monarchy as God and the devil." He reiterated his famous phrase, "No bishop, no king," and continued, "If this be all you party hath to say, I will make them conform themselves, or else I will harry them out of the land."

At the end of the three-day conference, a few minor concessions were granted, but the King refused to meet the petitioners on any of the main points. In fact, enforcement of the royal policy by Archbishop Bancroft led to the ejection of some 300 clergy from their livings for refusing to subscribe *ex animo* to the Book of Common Prayer.

The sympathies of the Commons were predominantly on the side of the Puritan ministers in their conflict with the King and the bishops. During their first session, in an address called "Form of Apology and Satis-

(Please turn to page thirty-six)



# The Siege of Yorktown

Charles G. Wilber

*Fordham University*

**I**N SPITE of military rules to the contrary, many soldiers have kept diaries which describe in great detail historical events of which they were a part. Colonel Jonathan Trumbull, aide-de-camp to General Washington during the Revolution, was such a writer. His description of the siege of Yorktown is interesting, especially since it is written from the point of view of an officer on the commanding general's staff. The following account is taken from that staff officer's diary.<sup>1</sup>

The journal in question begins on August 12, 1781 (Trumbull actually wrote the date as 1780 but that year is obviously incorrect). The first part of the diary is taken up with a description of various preparations and conferences and the names of Rochambeau, Lafayette, and de Grasse flow familiarly across the pages. Trumbull conveys the impression that great concern was felt at that time over lack of news from the French fleet. The advent of news of its arrival brought relief to everyone concerned with the expedition.

Washington is pictured as being worried over the perennial problem of transportation for supplies. He knew quite well that the surrounding country could not furnish him with enough wagons and so he strove to collect as many as possible in the larger cities.

The description of the actual siege of Yorktown is begun on September 28 when the troops, which had collected at Williamsburg, set off on their march to the objective. That day they approached to within about two miles of Yorktown. On the way the British cavalry attempted to oppose them, but two field pieces were brought up and the cavalry lost interest in the fight.

That night they camped "in the rough." Washington, in the style of a true leader, shared the hardships with the men. Trumbull says: "The General (Washington) and family sleep in the field without any other cover than the canopy of the Heavens and the small spread of Branches of a Tree."

Previous to this time, the port at Gloucester on the opposite side of the York River had been surrounded by militia under General Weedon and by French troops. French ships were lying in the mouth of the York River. It is thus obvious that the British were completely cut off except by water above Yorktown. In this latter direction, enemy boats on the river became an annoyance, and Washington suggested to the French Admiral de Grasse that he run some ships up the river above the town and station them there. It was done.

On September 29, the American troops took their position in front of the enemy's works; the French

troops occupied the Americans' left. There was very little activity during the day and only small fire from the British.

The next day (September 30) the British vacated their exterior works and retired to the interior defenses of the town. The Americans immediately took over the former enemy positions and found themselves favorably situated. Small gunfire was observed during the day. During the night the Americans threw up defense works. On this same night the American officer of the day was seriously wounded and was captured by the British. He was, later in the week, returned to his own lines under a flag of truce but died a few days after that as a result of his wounds.

On October 1 work was continued on the defenses. Heavy artillery stores were coming up by overland route. There were numerous delays in this regard, as Washington had feared, because of the severe lack of necessary wagons. The personal wagons of the general and of his high ranking officers were used to meet the emergency. The enemy kept up a mild fire with little effect.

The next day supplies were still arriving in a slow stream. Four Americans were killed by chance shots from the enemy.

On October 3, labor on the defense works was continued. Supplies were still arriving. Very little fire came from the British and none from the Americans because "The General determined to return no fire upon the Enemy 'till our Batteries are all ready to play to some purpose."

The following day there was little activity. At night American patrols were sent out and some of them approached quite close to the British lines. They caused an alarm and stimulated much musket fire and noise. However, only one American was killed.

On October 5 several ox teams arrived and aided greatly in transporting essential items of material. Since the supply problem was now on its way to solution, preparations for an offensive were begun.

These preparations continued during the next day. On this day the enemy fired spasmodically. At night circumvallation was begun and trenches were opened at a distance of 600 yards from the British lines. This work was finished by morning to the complete surprise of the enemy.

On the 7th the works were strengthened. On neither this day nor on the next did the enemy molest the Americans. The lack of response from the British led Trumbull to refer to them as "remarkably civil". On the 8th almost all the batteries were in position and ready to fire.

<sup>1</sup> Military Journal of Colonel Jonathan Trumbull, Aid-de-Camp to General Washington, Describing the Siege and Surrender of Yorktown. 1781. Original MS, Fordham University Library.



On October 9 one American and one French battery commenced firing at 4 p. m. The return fire was negligible.

On the following day all the American batteries opened up early in the morning. There were, according to Trumbull, approximately sixty cannon and mortars operating. Fire was continued until 10 a. m. when it was decreased. The British fire was completely silenced. In the evening the Americans took up a heavy fire again, but received no return. During the day one of the ships of the French fleet was burnt to the water line.

On October 11 the American batteries opened up again, but there was little enemy response. Another French ship was destroyed by fire. By this time the second line of trenches was within 400 yards of the town. The enemy remained within their lines. Evidently this strange behavior on the part of the British was unexpected for Trumbull says: "The Opposition from his Lordship [is] by no means equal to our expectations, considering his high character for Bravery—Military Skill and Activity."

On the next day preparations were made to move the artillery closer to the town. This stimulated the British to increase their fire a little, but the effect was negligible. The moving of the batteries was completed the following day. At that time the enemy fire became more effective.

It had been observed that there were two redoubts on the enemy left. They caused much annoyance to the Americans, and it was thought that they might prove useful in later operations. It was, consequently, decided to take the strongholds. Therefore, on the evening of October 14 a sham attack was made on the enemy right, and at the same time a full scale attack by two "divisions" of troops was made against the two redoubts. They were carried immediately, with small loss to the Americans. Seventy-three enemy prisoners were taken, some were killed, and others ran away (among this latter group was the British Colonel McPherson). This operation left the left flank of the enemy uncovered.

On October 15 the trenches were brought in line with the captured redoubts. During the night there was an ineffective and half-hearted sortie by the enemy.

The next day the batteries were reorganized and brought in closer to the town.

On October 17 they were ready to blast away when a flag of truce from the town was observed. It brought a request from the British for a conference dealing with surrender. The truce continued through the next day while the articles of surrender were being prepared.

On October 19 the capitulation was signed, and the British troops were marched out of the city. Cornwallis, the commander, was invited to dine with Washington and his staff. However, he declined on the plea of ill health and kept to his quarters. The actual surrender took place outside of the town. "General O'Hara conducts the troops and is attended by General Lincoln. Our Army [is] arranged in two lines thro[ugh] which the prisoners pass. The Americans

[are] on the right; the Allies on the left. The two Generals with their suites [are] at the head of their lines on horseback—a grand spectacle."

Later Trumbull describes the return of Washington to Mt. Vernon and the death of Mr. Custis and his own return to Philadelphia.

One interesting point of his journal indicates the type of leader Washington was. When the men slept out in the open with no shelter, he joined them and apparently his staff did also. Later, when there was a dearth of needed transportation, he surrendered his own vehicle and had it put to work hauling supplies.

Another point of interest is the unexplained inactivity of the British during the siege. On October 1 a strong attack, supported by artillery, might have broken the American lines; for it will be remembered that Washington's supply system was on that day very inadequate. Apparently, Cornwallis decided to play a strictly defensive role. His actions came as somewhat of a surprise to the Americans as is evident from the comments made by Colonel Trumbull on October 11.

## Christian Democrats

(Continued from page twenty-eight)

try, and local councils representing labor and management equally have been set up, to bring them into closer cooperation with one another, and to enable them to advise government, primarily through the National Council, on desired legislation. In Austria, nationalized property has been substantially retroceded to worker's cooperatives, making them co-owners of given enterprises. Thus intermediary groups are created in which the state is influential, without however playing the decisive role. In France nationalization has been modified or "mediatized", through the establishment of tripartite councils representing the state, employees and the consumers to manage the nationalized units. There also a National Economic Council has been created to advise on proper legislation, and help draft it.<sup>15</sup>

There is of course no agreement among Christian Democrats on a single, detailed, and practical program for achieving economic democracy. The parties are primarily national political organizations, and their immediate attention is directed to the particular economic and financial problems that their countries face. Moreover, within any single Christian Democrat group there is a diversity of opinion regarding particular issues. The 1945 MRP program described economic democracy as being characterized "by the effective participation of all in the management of economic affairs, by a more equal distribution of income, by respect for the rights of each".<sup>16</sup> The notion of democracy as a system of self-government is held up as the model and

<sup>15</sup> An excellent condensed analysis of Christian Democrat economic reforms in France and Austria is found in N. S. Timasheff, "Nationalization in Europe and Catholic Social Doctrine", *Catholic Mind* XLVI (January 1948). See also Paul Bacon, *La Réforme de l'Entreprise Capitaliste* (Paris: Société D'Éditions Republiques Populaires, 1947); Pierre Pfimlin, *Perspectives sur notre économie* (Paris: Société D'Éditions Republiques Populaires, 1947); Alfred Kasames, *Wir Wollen Österreich: Die Grundsätze und Ziele der Österreichischen Volkspartei* (Vienna: Österreichischen Verlag, 1947).

<sup>16</sup> *CIP* (5 Beekman St., Brooklyn, N. Y.), Feb. 28, 1948, p. 3.



ideal for the economic order also. Christian Democrats seek to discover the means which will assure a larger participation of the people in the making of economic decisions and in responsibility for them.

Robert Lecourt of the MRP, writing in its party organ *L'Aube*, has declared that slogans of free enterprise are no longer valid when liberty is threatened by it: "The liberty of living comes before the liberty of enriching one's self".<sup>17</sup> Italian Christian Democrat Fanfani, who is Minister of Labor in the De Gasperi Government, believes that "the legitimately constituted authority . . . has the duty to intervene, to coordinate, integrate, and sustain the efforts of individuals in economic matters when necessary to obtain the full development of the human person and the common good".<sup>18</sup> François de Menthon of the MRP, a member of almost every French government since the liberation, emphasizes that nationalization is not a panacea: "Although rendered indispensable by the circumstances, the planned economy must be conciliated with a maximum of private initiative and personal responsibility . . . For the liberation of the worker and the real transformation of the daily working life, it would be completely illusory to change private direction to bureaucratic direction, the capitalist enterprise for the state enterprise. In practice the subordination of the worker would remain unchanged, his condition as a wage earner would be identical".<sup>19</sup>

Christian Democracy, by founding its economic policy on the principle of subsidiarity, retains a flexibility which prevents it from being identified completely with either free enterprise or a planned economy. Except where there exist abuses by financial and economic groups, Christian Democracy desires the state to aid and to coordinate, rather than to absorb.

Early social and political action in the name of Christian Democracy can be traced back to the second quarter of the nineteenth century. In France, Lamennais was writing for social justice in *L'Avenir*, and Lacordaire was championing Christian Democrat principles in the National Assembly, as was Montalembert in the House of Peers. At a Catholic International Congress at Malines in 1863, Montalembert declared: "The new society, democracy, to call it by its name, exists, and in half of Europe it is already sovereign: in the other half it will be so tomorrow. In the new order Catholics will have to fight, but will have nothing to fear".<sup>20</sup> Frederic Ozanam gave meaning to, and affirmed Christian Democracy from his professional chair at the Sorbonne from 1847 to 1853, and also through his newspaper and organizational activity. He realized the need for Catholics to dedicate themselves to social and political reforms, and maintained that they must support the just claims of the working classes. In 1848 he asserted: "Let us . . . turn toward that democracy, that people that does not know us, let us woo them, not only with those alms which make men

obliged to men, but with our efforts to obtain for them institutions that will set them free and improve them".<sup>21</sup> In the same year, when he was directing *L'Ere Nouvelle* in Paris, he wrote to his brother: "I have believed and still believe in the possibility of Christian Democracy".<sup>22</sup>

In Germany the Christian Democrat von Ketteler combatted capitalistic absolutism in the Frankfurt National Assembly, where he laid the foundations of the Centre Party. In Italy Gioachino Ventura, a friend of Ozanam's, together with Abbé Serbati, laid the foundations of political Christian Democracy in that country; Vincenzo Gioberti and Cesare Balbo favored Italian federation, and both were members of the Subalpine Government. Manzoni and D'Ondes were other early Italian Christian Democrats. But the history of early Christian Democracy cannot be related in this short summary; in Austria von Vogelsang; in France La Tour du Pin, Albert de Mun, and Léon Harmel; in Germany Hitze; in Switzerland De Courtins; in Italy Toniolo; in the Low Countries Pottier and Schaepman: —these men and a host of others exercised an influence in detaching Christians from laissez-faire, and oriented them towards a study of social problems and corresponding legislative and organizational work.<sup>23</sup>

Pope Leo XIII and his *Rerum Novarum* had a profound effect on the development of Christian Democracy. His most famous encyclical was well received in liberal Protestant circles and by certain Socialist groups; it admitted state intervention in social matters, and called for a family wage. He proposed mixed corporations of workers and employers but accepted class syndicates, provided that an agreement among all factors of production be reached. Leo sided with labor, and as such became known as the "Workingman's Pope". He pleaded that property be spread over all social classes, as a means of preserving the human personality and the consistence of individual families. He stressed the social function of property. Leo turned the Christian world towards a study and remedy of the worker's problems. He formed a true social mentality among students and cultural groups as well as among the working classes. He condemned the hostility of conservative Catholics to social reforms.<sup>24</sup>

The first political party in which was formed a Christian Democrat nucleus was the Belgian Catholic Party, which was created in 1847. This party has dominated Belgian politics ever since its inception, and by the 1930s the Christian Democrat group within it had begun to cooperate with Socialist groups to solve common social and economic problems. This was the era of cooperation between Van Zeeland and De Man. The influence of the Christian Democrat nucleus of the party was largely responsible for stopping the Rexist

<sup>21</sup> Quoted by Sturzo in "Christian Democracy", *Social Action*, X (May 15, 1944), 11.

<sup>22</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>23</sup> A good concise history of Christian Democracy can be found in Sturzo, *Nationalism and Internationalism* (New York: Roy, 1946), Chapt. 4.

<sup>24</sup> Pope Leo XIII *Rerum Novarum* (Rome, 1891), Eng. trans. by J. J. Wynne (3rd Ed., New York, 1903), pp. 208-248, or *Five Great Encyclicals* (New York: Paulist Press, 1940), pp. 1-29.

<sup>17</sup> *L'Aube* (Paris), June 25, 1948, p. 1.

<sup>18</sup> *Loc. cit.*, CIP.

<sup>19</sup> CIP, June 25, 1948, p. 4.

<sup>20</sup> *For Democracy, a Symposium* (London: Burns, Oates & Washburne, Ltd., 1939), p. 62.



threat in 1936. Today the Parti Social Chrétien, successor to the old Catholic Party, is dominated by Christian Democrats, young men who distinguished themselves in the resistance. It is the first party of Belgium, with 92 of 202 Lower Chamber seats, and is participating in a coalition government with the Socialists; and the two parties have cooperated to legislate for "structural reforms" of industry. Friction continues between them, however, on the Leopold question and the school dispute.<sup>25</sup>

In 1852 the Prussian Catholic Fraction Party was created, to become in 1870 the Centre Party. Led notably by Ludwig Windthorst, it defended freedom of religion and of education to defeat Bismarck's Kulturkampf, and then cooperated with the "conservative-socialist" to enact progressive social legislation. During the Republic, the Centre Party maintained a steady Reichstag average of about ninety-two deputies, until Hitler ended political activity in 1933. Its leaders played a major role in the underground resistance,<sup>26</sup> and created the Christian Democratic Union, consisting of Catholics and Protestants who had seen at first hand the evil results of state worship to the exclusion of moral values, and who desired to resurrect constitutional government on a federal basis, while at the same time achieving a genuine renovation of social and economic life. The CDU is the largest party in the western two-thirds of Germany, at least on the basis of the 1946 elections, and heads the state governments in coalition with the Socialists, with whose cooperation they have drawn up democratic state constitutions.<sup>27</sup> The CDU, which is the largest party in the Bizonal Economic regime with 20 of 52 seats in the Council, is also playing a large part in the drafting at Bonn of a constitution for the new Germany.<sup>28</sup> Konrad Adenauer in the British zone, and Jacob Kaiser in Berlin are its outstanding leaders; they differ on the extent to which the German economy should be modified, and there is a possibility of future split in party ranks, with Adenauer leading the more conservative elements.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>25</sup> The best discussion of *Belgian Politics* is a doctoral thesis by Carl H. Hojer, *Le Régime Parlementaire Belge, de 1918 à 1940* (Uppsala och Stockholm: Almqvist Wiksell, Biktrayers AB, 1946). PSC Chairman Edmond de Schryver has written "Le Parti Social Chrétien", *Annals* 247 (Sept. 1946). See also "The Constitutional Crisis in Belgium", *Foreign Affairs*, Jan. 1946; "Belgium and Her Problems", *World Today* 2 (Oct. 1946). For relations between the Socialists and PSC see *L'Aube*, July 5, p. 4, and Aug. 13, p. 3, 1948.

<sup>26</sup> Gabriel A. Almond, "The German Resistance Movement", *Current History* (May-June 1946); pp. 32-46; Rudolf Pechel, *Deutscher Widerstand* (Zurich 1947); Michael Power, *Religion in the German Reich* (New York: Longmans, 1939); Ulrich von Hassel, *Das Andere Deutschland*.

<sup>27</sup> For the constitutions see J. Pollock, *Change and Crisis in European Government* (New York: Rinehart, 1947), p. 41; State Department Publication 2783, pp. 191-211; *America*, Dec. 1946, p. 284.

<sup>28</sup> For Bonn constitution efforts see *New York Times*, June 8, July 7, Aug. 29, Sept. 6, Oct. 16, 1948.

<sup>29</sup> There still remains a small Centre Party in the British zone with which the CDU seeks a common program; see *CIP*, Aug. 21, 1948, p. 3. The CDU sustained some losses in Bavarian municipal elections in May 1948, but at the same time showed slight gains in similar elections in N. Rhineland-Westphalia. See *Summary of Major Developments in American Foreign Policy* (Brookings Instit.), May-June 1946, 1948, p. 29; *New York Times*, June 1, 1948, p. 16, and Sept. 6, 1948.

The third party out of which Christian Democracy evolved was the Catholic Party in the Netherlands, formed in 1888 by Hermanus J. A. M. Schaepman, who was largely responsible for legislation in the Estates General which extended the franchise and aided the cause of labor. Called today the Catholic People's Party, it lives up to Christian Democrat principles, and in cooperation with the Socialists is achieving industrial reforms similar to those already enacted in Belgium. As it is the largest party of the lower chamber with 32 of 100 seats, it seems likely to continue its dominant role in Dutch politics. In the Netherlands, where the harmony between Socialists and Christian Democrats has been enhanced by a democratic solution of the education question, political life appears to be the most stable of any of the continental European states; this indeed is in keeping with national tradition.<sup>30</sup>

The next Christian Democrat nucleus to be formed was that of Albert de Mun's Ralliés in France in 1892. In the "era of good feeling" which succeeded the collapse of the Boulanger movement, the Ralliés (Catholics rallying to the Republic), joined with the Socialists to legislate important social reforms from 1892-1898.<sup>31</sup> Succeeded in turn by the Sillonistes and the Young Republican League, and inspired by the Semaines Sociales, the Christian Democrat nucleus, led by Marc Sagnier, merged into the Popular Democrat Party.<sup>32</sup> This party, which developed Georges Bidault, Henri Teitgen and François de Menthon, reached its greatest strength in 1936 when it placed twenty-three deputies in the Chamber.<sup>33</sup> In 1934 Francisque Gay founded the Christian Democrat newspaper *L'Aube*, which is today the party organ of the MRP. The young Popular Democrats played a conspicuous part in the resistance, most notably Bidault, who was chairman of the National Resistance Council.<sup>34</sup> With the support of the Jeunesse Ouvrière Catholique (JOC),<sup>35</sup> and the French Confederation of Christian Workers (CFTC), the old Popular Democrats emerged from the war as the Mouvement Républicain Populaire. The MRP has been well represented in all nine French governments since the liberation, except that of Léon Blum, (Dec. 12, 1946-Jan. 12, 1947), and was mainly responsible for the

<sup>30</sup> Dutch governments during the reign of Wilhelmina averaged three years in length. Dutch politics are described in *Contemporary Europe*, a Symposium (New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1941), pp. 179-181. See also H. C. Tuow, "The Resistance of the Netherlands Churches", *Annals* 245 (May 1946), pp. 149-161; *The Urgency Program of the Catholic People's Party*, Secretariat General, 40 Koninginnegracht (The Hague, 1946); J. J. Quigley, "Education in the Netherlands", *Catholic Education Review*, June 1939; *Chicago Tribune*, Aug. 8, 1948, p. 2.

<sup>31</sup> C. J. H. Hayes, *A Political and Cultural History of Modern Europe*, vol. 2 (New York: MacMillan, revised ed., 1939), p. 410.

<sup>32</sup> See Georges Weill, *Histoire de Mouvement Social en France* (Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan, 1924), pp. 417-423. The "Sillon" was condemned by Pius X for some of its tenets, even though the Pontiff was in sympathy with its inspiration and the movement of which it was a link.

<sup>33</sup> *Annuaire de la France* 1936, p. 271.

<sup>34</sup> For the Christian Democrat resistance movement in France see "Resistance Groups in France", *Political Science Quarterly* LXII (March 1947); "La Résistance et la Renaissance", *French Press and Information Service* (New York, 1944); Claire Bishop, *France Alive* (New York: McMullan, 1948), 218 pp.

<sup>35</sup> See the *Young Christian Workers* (London: Burns, Oates & Washburne, 1943), 82 pp.



drafting of the Constitution approved by referendum in 1946, although it had to make important concessions to other parties, resulting in its split with De Gaulle, who opposed it.<sup>36</sup> From that time on the MRP began to lose voters to De Gaulle. The MRP polled 26% of the vote in the national election of November, 1946,<sup>37</sup> but dropped to 10% in the municipal elections of November 1947,<sup>38</sup> due to the rise of DeGaullism and the unrest engendered by Communist tactics. The first Schuman Government (Nov. 22, 1947-July 19, 1948) signalized the organization of the Third Force: Socialists, Popular Republicans and Radicals who have tried to steer a middle path between Communism and De Gaullism. The MRP has continued its role as the bulwark (166 of 618 Assembly seats) of the Third Force in the subsequent governments of Marie, Schuman, and Queuille.<sup>39</sup> But the Third Force was split by internal dissensions as well as from pressure from without; its weakness has been most recently evidenced by the elections to the Council of the Republic in October-November 1948.<sup>40</sup>

Christian Democrat groups were organized locally as early as 1900 in Italy, but it was not until 1919 that Luigi Sturzo established a national party based on Christian Democrat principles, the Popular Party. This party won 107 seats in a Chamber of 535 in 1921, and played a prominent role until Sturzo was exiled by Mussolini, who forced the dissolution of the party in 1926.<sup>41</sup> Younger men, most notably De Gasperi, continued to develop the Christian Democrat movement underground, so that by June 1944 it was the largest party in the Giunta (united resistance groups), which was the basis for the Bonomi and Parri governments. De Gasperi became premier in December 1945 and has been chief executive ever since.<sup>42</sup> The Christian Democrats were the largest party in the Constituent Assembly, elected in June 1946; they dominated the drafting of the Constitution,<sup>43</sup> which came into being on January 1, 1948, and voted for the Republic in the June 1946 referendum. As the MRP has the backing of the JOC and CFTC, so does the Italian Christian Democrat Party have the support of the Italian

Association of Christian Workers (ACLI), and the party is strongest in the industrial north, as the 1946 and 1948 election statistics prove.<sup>44</sup> The world important elections of April 1948 brought the Christian Democrats their greatest victory; they won 307 of 574 Chamber seats, to gain an absolute majority in the Chamber.<sup>45</sup> The De Gasperi Government contains eleven Christian Democrats, four right-wing Socialists, three Republicans, two Liberals and two independents. The Christian Democrats recognize that much is rotten in Italy and endorse taxing the rich and breaking up the feudal estates. Confida, the powerful landowners' organization, which had previously been a regular contributor to Christian Democrat campaigns, proffered a large sum for that of 1948, but asked that the party go easy on agricultural reforms. Though the party was hard-pressed for funds, De Gasperi did not take the money.<sup>46</sup> On the eve of the April 18th election he declared that "Christian Democracy is the party of the little people; it repudiates the spirit of reaction and marches toward reforms and social justice . . . I'm in the center, and the center is shifting left".<sup>47</sup> The major problem now for the Christian Democrats is to make good De Gasperi's post election boast: "We are not reactionaries, every social reform promised will be made".<sup>48</sup>

The last major political party to be formed, from which Christian Democracy emerged as the dominant force, was the Christian Social Party, which together with the Socialists and Nationalists formed the Austrian Republic in November 1920. Under the early leadership of Ignaz Seipel, who was Chancellor from 1922-1924, and 1925-1929, the party became the most influential in Austria. The parliamentary system was to fail, however, due to the lack of any common denominator between the two leading parties. Both Christian Socialists and Social Democrats shared in this failure. By April 1934 the party, led by Engelbert Dollfuss, established an authoritarian government, troubled by civil strife and Nazi pressure which threatened Austria's independence. Dollfuss lost his life at the hands of the Nazis during their abortive coup in July 1934. Kurt von Schuschnigg took over the party and government until Germany absorbed Austria in March 1938, and Schuschnigg began his seven-year term in Nazi prisons.<sup>49</sup> The post-war People's Party is a continuation of the Christian Social Party, divested of its authoritarianism and based on principles of democracy; led by young, aggressive resistance heroes (the top five leaders are all under forty-five),<sup>50</sup> the

<sup>36</sup> See *Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service*, July 4, 1946, p. J1, and Sept. 30, 1946, p. J1; also *A Constitution for the Fourth French Republic*, Foundation for Foreign Affairs pamphlet No. 2, 1947.

<sup>37</sup> *L'Aube*, Nov. 11, 1946, pp. 1, 2.

<sup>38</sup> *News From France*, French Embassy Information Service, Oct. 30, 1947; *World Today* (R. I. I. A.), Dec. 1947, pp. 529-536.

<sup>39</sup> The MRP has not been responsible for the fall of any of the Third Force governments, Nov. 1947-Nov. 1948. See *L'Aube*, July 17, p. 2, July 20, p. 1, and Sept. 8, 1948.

<sup>40</sup> For Council of the Republic election results see *L'Aube*, Oct. 18, 1948, and *New York Times*, Oct. 19 and Nov. 9, 1948. For the school question see *L'Aube*, Aug. 14, p. 2, Aug. 28, p. 2, Sept. 28, p. 2. For nationalization failure see *ibid.*, June 24, 1948, p. 2. For MRP-De Gaulle relations see *ibid.*, July 17, p. 2.

<sup>41</sup> A good description of the Popolari is found in Malcolm Moos, "Luigi Sturzo, Christian Democrat", *American Pol. Sci. Rev.* (April 1945), pp. 270-277.

<sup>42</sup> A good brief history of De Gasperi is found in E. O. Hauser, "The Strangest Strong Man in Europe", *Sat. Eve. Post*, Sept. 4, 1948.

<sup>43</sup> Official text in *Gazette Officielle della Repubblica Italiana*, Dec. 27, 1947. An English trans. is found in *U. S. Dept. State Documents and State Papers*, Vol. 1, April 1948. See also *Quaderni della Democrazia Cristiana*, No. 16 S. E. L. I., Rome 1946, and *World Today*, July 1948.

<sup>44</sup> For June 1946 election results see *Bolletino de Informazione e Documentazione del Ministero per la Costituente* (Rome, No. 16, 1946); for 1948 statistics see *New York Times*, April 25, 1948, p. 4E; Mario Einaudi, "The Italian Elections of 1948", *Review of Politics*, July 1948.

<sup>45</sup> *Loc. cit.*; see also *New York Times*, April 22, pp. 1, 2.

<sup>46</sup> Hauser, *op. cit.*

<sup>47</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>48</sup> Catherine Maher, "The Christian Democrat Victory", *America*, p. 133, May 15, 1948.

<sup>49</sup> See Schuschnigg, *My America* (New York: Knopf 1938) and *Austrian Requiem* (New York: Putnam 1946).

<sup>50</sup> The five leaders are Figl, Gruber, Weinberger, Hurdes and Graf. For the Austrian Christian Democrat Resistance see *Foreign Affairs* 125 (Jan. 1947), p. 237. For Austrian Politics see Mary



new party won 84 of 165 mandates in the November 1945 elections to gain an absolute majority in the legislature. Chancellor Figl's government is a coalition of the People's Party and the Socialists, both of whom are determined to maintain Austrian independence in the face of Soviet pressure, and to continue their reform of the economic structure.<sup>51</sup>

Of the major Christian Democrat groups described, the Dutch, and to a lesser degree the Belgian, appear to be the most stable and permanent. The Italian Christian Democrats have had a sensational success, but their future depends on their ability to achieve land reform, and in cooperation with the Marshall Plan, to bring economic well-being to Italy. The German Christian Democrats, although superficially strong, appear to be suffering from a split between the progressive wing, led by the trade unionist Jacob Kaiser, and the more conservative wing, led by Konrad Adenauer. Both, however, seem to agree on limited nationalization, as advocated by Karl Arnold, CDU chief executive of North Rhineland-Westphalia.<sup>52</sup> The CDU is exerting strong pressure at Bonn to insure the drafting of a federal system, as opposed to the unitary state desired by the Socialists. The French MRP seems to be receding from its immediate post-war successes to the hard nucleus from which it originated, although there is a possibility of resurgence, if one assumes the eventual end of crisis government in France. The Austrian picture is less clear, although it does seem evident that the Socialists and Christian Democrats are cooperating in a spirit of mutual trust and harmony within the parliamentary framework, which augers well for Austria. The development of Christian Democracy behind the Iron Curtain, which was in some cases quite advanced by 1945, will of course remain arrested for the time being.<sup>53</sup>

Luxembourg has a strong Christian Democrat party which won the election of October 1945 and controls the Government. A similar group in Switzerland strongly influences Swiss government. In Norway the Christian People's Party has developed in spectacular fashion since the war, although it is still comparatively small.<sup>54</sup> In Great Britain eighty members of Parliament have formed a "Parliamentary Christian Social Group" to reaffirm the Christian basis of the British Labor movement and to show that social and economic reforms advocated by the Labor Party are in basic accord with Christian principles.<sup>55</sup> There are also Christian Democrat groups in Mexico and in South America.

McDonald, *The Republic of Austria* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1946), and Paul R. Sweet, "The New Austria", *Journal of Politics*, 2 (Aug. 1946).

<sup>51</sup> For Soviet pressure see *New York Times*, June 14, 17, 18, 26, 27; July 24; Oct. 12, 1948.

<sup>52</sup> For Arnold's plan see *CIP*, Oct. 9, 1948. For Kaiser's story, see *Newsweek*, Sept. 30, 1946, p. 39.

<sup>53</sup> These parties were the Popular Party (Czech.), Smallholders (Hungary), Christian Labor Party (Poland), National Peasant Party (Rumania), Agrarian National Union (Bulgaria), and Slovene People's Party and Peasant parties (Yugoslavia).

<sup>54</sup> Dr. Eric Bellquist, "Government and Politics of Northern Europe", *Journal of Politics*, Aug. 1946, p. 381.

<sup>55</sup> *CIP*, June 12, 1948, p. 3; Sir Stafford Cripps has written a book entitled *Christian Democracy* (London, 1948).

The various Christian Democrat parties maintain contact with one another through the *Nouvelles Equipes Internationales*, which was formed in March 1947.<sup>56</sup> This is an informal Christian Democrat "International" which holds periodic conferences throughout Western Europe in which party representatives meet and exchange their views. Its philosophy was well expressed by Maurice Schumann of the French MRP, who, in addressing a conference of Christian Democrats in London on June 5th, 1948, declared: "This is the time to remember that the best defense against a powerful and positive dynamic ideology is neither verbal attack nor criticism, but the setting up of an equally powerful and dynamic ideology against it".<sup>57</sup>

<sup>56</sup> *Nouvelles Equipes Internationales* are described in *People and Freedom* (32 Chepstow Villas, London W. 11), July and August 1947 issues; see also *Sword* (12 City Rd., London), Dec. 1947. The syndicalist support of the Christian Democrat parties, the Christian Trade Unions, are organized in the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions representing two and a half million workers.

<sup>57</sup> *CIP*, June 5, 1948, p. 4.

## Church-State

(Continued from page thirty)

faction to be Presented to his Majesty," they took occasion to state—in opposition to the ecclesiastical supremacy and the Stuart stand generally—what may be termed the parliamentary position on matters of religion.

For matter of religion, it will appear by examination of truth and right, that your Majesty would be misinformed if any man should deliver that the Kings of England have absolute power in themselves, either to alter religion (which God defend should be in the power of any mortal man whatsoever), or to make laws concerning the same, otherwise than as in temporal causes, by the consent of Parliament.

But the language of the "Apology" will serve to disabuse our minds of any idea that the ecclesiastical system which the Commons contemplated allowed anything of the nature of religious liberty or "toleration." "Neither desire we so much that any man, in regard of weakness of conscience, may be exempted after Parliament from obedience to laws established, as that in this Parliament such laws may be enacted as by the relinquishment of some few ceremonies of small importance, or by any better way, a perpetual uniformity may be enjoyed and observed." From this and similar statements we see that Commons proposed to take the religious settlement out of the hands of the King and to make by statute those concessions to the Puritans which he had refused to make by an exercise of the supremacy; but after that, conformity was to be rigidly enforced. As one observer aptly remarks, "Where James chastised with whips, the Commons were prepared to chastise with scorpions." This explains why there was always a minority in the country ready to support the Crown, even though many in this minority group had no stomach for the Stuarts' absolutist pretensions. On the other hand, the intransigent stand taken by James, and later by his son and successor Charles, was a dominant factor in the increasing withdrawal of Puritans from the Anglican ranks and the coalition of the various religious sects against royalistic forces in the mid-century conflict.

It is a familiar fact of history that the end of



Charles I's absolute government was the direct consequence of his attempt, in 1637, to enforce a new liturgy in Scotland. The resistance of the Scots not only revolutionized the Church in that country, but so embarrassed the King in England that he was obliged to summon the parliament that eventually dethroned him. Ecclesiastically the overturn in Scotland consisted in the abolition of the episcopacy and the establishment of a Presbyterian form of church government on the lines which Knox had derived from Calvin. This signified the ultimate triumph of the anti-prelatical ideas and tendencies which James I had succeeded in resisting in both Scotland and England.

The year 1640 saw the problem of dominance of Church or State in England coming rapidly to a crisis. Though it was merely one facet of the royal struggle with parliament, its importance was accentuated by the strong alliance between Church and king, and by the increasing value of the Presbyterian-dominated Scots as potential allies in that struggle. In the field of political philosophy the problem was embedded in the ever-present question of ultimate sovereignty; as far as the bulk of English parliamentarians and lawyers was concerned it was generally conceded that the State should be master of the Church, no matter who held the State. Had the clergy of the Establishment proved more amenable to the wishes of parliament, there would of course have been less support for the king, but the status of the Church probably would not have been too belligerently challenged by Commons. However, the entry upon the scene of the Scots with their theoretically theoretic government raised uncontrollable turmoil even before the object of their intervention had been achieved. Erastianism met the shock of theocracy, and the eventual result was religious "toleration" or more accurately, religious indifference combined with an increasing preoccupation with material interests.

During the Civil War the collapse of the royal and episcopal party left the temporary coalition of parliamentarian and Puritan triumphant. But as soon as the mutual danger disappeared, the partnership dissolved. The parliamentary side is revealed to contain men of all sorts of religious opinions, from the most prelatical to the most individualistic and radical. On the other hand, the Puritan group contained men whose political preferences varied from semi-absolutist monarchy to the new millennial democracy. The interplay of these forces under the catalyst of the Scotch Presbyterians' presence provides the key to the confusion in parliament, a confusion finally ended only by a dictatorship more or less tolerant of all varieties of religion. The ease with which the Restoration of the crown and episcopacy was achieved appears to have been due partly to the national dissatisfaction with the general course of events since the open defiance of the monarchy twenty years previously, partly to the guilty subconscious conviction that the acts of the 1640 decade were not altogether justified, partly to sheer political and religious exhaustion from the quarrels of the intervening period.

With the defeat of the king and the crushing of prelacy, there remained in the English government three

chief factions: The Presbyterian group, though quite large, was little more than a phalanx of puppets for the Scotch army and the Scotch clergy gathered in the Assembly of Divines; the middle group consisted principally of moderate Puritans who were no more anxious to be dominated by presbyters than by bishops; then there was an increasing number of outspoken, vigorous radical thinkers whose views ranged from Christian communism to Quaker pacifism.

The Presbyterian party, of which its opponents said that "new presbyter is but old pries writ large," was determined to see in England that strong personification of Calvinism which dominated Scotland. Commenting on their theory George Gooch says, "The State was the servant of the Church and must carry only to obey the magistrate in so far as he executed its commands."

To the Separatist members of the triumphant coalition which eliminated royal power the approach of peace brought only vast dismay. They had, under a great deal of soul-searching and heart-burning, invited the Scots to assist them, quite unaware that the uncompromising Calvinism of their northern neighbors was a real threat to the Congregational polity which they hoped to see established. The Assembly of Divines which the Scots and Presbyterian English had foisted onto Parliament was a Presbyterian-dominated body, and the prospect of making the Assembly's Solemn League and Covenant the law of the land was horrible for the Independents to contemplate. They sought every political approach to ward off such a fate, and eventually deposited their trust in the army which smashed Presbyterian control. The whole period was filled with the furious pamphleteering of Presbyterian and Independent; and the constant ferment of religious thought, together with the troubled times, brought forth new groups of Independents—Baptists, Millenarians, Diggers, Levellers, Fifth Monarchy Men and Quakers. Up and down the line Independents were assailed by Presbyterians for begetting these sects, and Independent church government was arraigned as the father of religious and political anarchy.

Among the moderate Separatists there was much fear of Calvinistic and radical thinkers. In contrast to the Presbyterians, these Independents, especially those who were formerly Puritans on the Anglican fringe, tended to be Erastian; they distinguished themselves from the radicals by insisting upon some sort of established church with varying degrees of compulsive conformity. On the other hand, the old-time Independents of the Barrows-Browne tradition were compelled by their beliefs to renounce all types of compulsion. These descendants of the Elizabethan Brownists maintained that while the subjection to civil government was natural to man, subjection to church government could lawfully arise only through a church covenant whereby the individual voluntarily submitted to the hegemony of ecclesiastical officials. This theory led them to a complete denial of any magisterial power to punish religious offenses. It also prompted them to emphasize the importance of fundamental law as against the legal pre-



cedents of English law adduced in support of the Erastian position.

The new Independents of Puritan background were headed by William Prynne and John Selden, lawyers in the Coke tradition. Prynne vehemently attacked Brownist ideology as conducive to anarchy. To him there seemed no difference between an independent church and an independent village, so far as things outside the positive ordinances of the Gospel were concerned. In his pamphlet, *The Sovereign Power of Parliament* (1643) he took the stand that while parliament might have nothing to do with doctrine it had everything to do with church government.

The political history of the Army began in 1647. "They thought," relates Baxter, "that God's providence had cast the trust of religion and the kingdom upon them as conquerors"; and parliament's proposal for their disbandment led to an explosion. While the officers formed a council, the rank and file chose agents or agitators; the two bodies quickly coalesced into the General Council of the Army, which pledged itself not to dissolve until it had obtained securities for the future. In June a detachment of troops acting on Cromwell's orders seized Charles I from his parliamentary captors. Immediately the Army chiefs began to negotiate with the King, offering to restore him to the throne and to accept Episcopacy if he would grant toleration. The scheme of the saner element was formulated in the "Heads of Proposals," sketched by Cromwell's son-in-law, General Ireton, and later amended by the Army Council. Among other provisions special precautions were laid down to safeguard religious liberty against Presbyterian intolerance. The "Heads of Proposals" has often been praised as a farsighted, statesmanlike plan, but it was in advance of the times and failed to satisfy either party; it was too tolerant and too democratic for the Royalist, too conservative and too balanced for the extremist.

Meanwhile there existed in the land a large and unoccupied military force. Most of it was stationed in various cantonments about the country, and there the idle minds of the troops came under the influence of men known later as Levellers. Extremely democratic in their outlook, the Levellers had derived from the Assembly-Parliament struggle certain definite convictions regarding the relationship of Church and State. They dreaded the possibility of a government which could compel the nation to conform to a state church, and in consequence they strongly advocated a policy in which liberty of conscience and worship would be assured. The Levellers, as Independents, were in search of a dynamic society rather than the static structure demanded by the Presbyterians. To defend their positions, they extended the Independent theory of basic unchanging ecclesiastical law into a similarly unchanging law of reason and of civil rights, fundamentally the law of God as they conceived it. In addition, the Independent covenant between man and Church was secularized so as to become the theory of the social compact.

The middle of the seventeenth century is the age of

Milton, and his thought looms as large on the politico-ecclesiastical landscape as his style and inspiration in the literary field. In 1640 Milton viewed England as suffering chiefly from the malady of episcopacy. The removal of the bishops would instantaneously solve the distressing problems of religion and peace, and the implicit goodness of Englishmen would react to create the new Holy Community. A clear view of the Scriptures was alone sufficient to determine the form and nature of the government of the Church since it is of heavenly origin and command, not of men. "It is dangerous and unworthy of the Gospel," he wrote during this period, "to hold that Church government is to be patterned by the law, as Bishop Andrewes and the Primate of Armagh maintain." Regarding the extent of control to be exercised by the civil magistrate in the ecclesiastical domain, Milton is not at all clear. In the pamphlet just cited, for instance, he limits himself to the nebulous statement, "The magistrate hath only to deal with the outward part, I mean not of the body alone but the mind in all her outward acts."

As time passes and he views the vicissitudes of the Church in a world of unregenerate men, his once sanguine assurance that a holy government was about to appear begins to fade, and he tends more and more toward the utilitarian conclusion that a holy Church should be separated from an unworthy State. He fails, however, to arrive at the complete and unqualified separation advocated by his friend, Roger Williams, possibly because he is unable to clarify in his own mind the role of grace in making a Christian. In fact, he continually clings to the hope of seeing God's kingdom on earth, a kingdom which it is his duty to help prepare and for which worldly institutions like government must be sanctified.

Toward the close of the Civil War period Milton became thoroughly disgusted with parliamentary government of the Church. About 1647 we find him speaking of the Long Parliament thus:

While they taught compulsion without convincement, which not long before they complained of, as executed unchristianity against themselves, these intents are clear to have been no better than anti-Christian; setting up a spiritual tyranny by a secular power, to the advancing of their own authority to the magistrate, whom they would have made their executioner, to punish church delinquencies, whereof civil laws have no cognizance.

Throughout the era of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate he met with nothing but disappointment in his hopes. Finally after the collapse of the Protectorate he made one final pamphleteering attack on the problem in a last-ditch stand to organize the New Jerusalem. The most famous essay of this period was his *Treatise on Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Causes*, addressed to Parliament. In this pamphlet he reached the conclusion that while it was the magistrate's duty to defend the Church and its judgments, that same magistrate had no power over the Church and must keep severely clear of it.

There can be no place then left for the magistrate or his force in the settlement of religion, by appointing either what we shall believe in divine things or practice in religion . . . Thus if Church governors cannot use force in religion, though but for this reason, because they cannot infallibly determine the conscience without convincement, much less have civil magistrates authority to use force where they can much less judge.



While Milton persisted in his quest for the Holy Community, he limited the State to the role of protecting those who wished to set up that community. Steering steadily towards William's viewpoint, he never quite reached it. He did transfer the privileges of Christian liberty into the civil sphere, like the radical sectaries, but unlike them he continued to dream of a new heaven on earth which men should labor to build, within and by means of all social institutions, including the State. Less radical and more systematic in his political philosophy than Milton, but at the same time definitely republican in his learning, was James Harrington, "the only observer of the Puritan Revolution who had any philosophical grasp of the social causes behind it." Harrington was a political thinker of quite unusual power and independence. While he was an aristocrat by birth and association, serving King Charles as personal gentleman right up to the scaffold, he took neither side in the Civil War. He consistently maintained popular sovereignty, yet believed that the natural aristocracy will inevitably rule. His chief work, *The Commonwealth of Oceana*, is a thinly-disguised analysis of English history, and a plan for the reform of the state on the basis of what he conceived to be classical lines, modeled to a considerable extent upon the constitution of Venice.

In Harrington's conception of the ideal commonwealth the Church should be completely subordinated to the State. "Laws ecclesiastical," he explains, "or such as concern religion according to the universal course of ancient prudence are in the power of the magistrate." His particular shade of Erastianism is more clearly revealed in the somewhat petulant query, "I wonder whence it is that men . . . will have ecclesiastical government to be necessarily distinct from civil power when the right of the elders, ordained by the holding up of hands in every congregation, to teach the people, was plainly derived from the same civil power by which they ordained the rest of their magistrates."

Despite his original premise of a state-dominated church and his provision for a governmental department called the "council of religion" to control the spiritual life of the nation, Harrington apparently perceived no inconsistency in opposing any form of coercion. His astonishing naivete is displayed when we closely juxtapose the following two statements which are widely separated in the *Oceana*: First, "A Commonwealth is nothing else but the national conscience. And the conviction of a man's private conscience produces his private religion, the conviction of the national conscience must produce a national religion"; and secondly, "The council shall suffer no coercive power in the matter of religion to be exercised in this nation . . . nor shall any gathered congregation be molested or interrupted in their way of worship (being neither Jewish or idolotrous—i. e., Catholic) but vigilantly and vigorously protected and defended in the enjoyment, practice and profession of the same." Moreover, religious peace is presumably to be safely secured by having disputed questions settled by the divines of the

two universities, debating and deciding independently of each other.

While Harrington's theories were never translated into practice, vigorous discussion of them did stimulate a great deal of rationalistic thinking in religious matters, especially with relation to church government. Rationalism, latitudinarianism and the practice of toleration, all within the framework of a modified Erastian church, fell quite naturally into the temper of a people exhausted by twenty years of turmoil, and left their mark on succeeding generations of British thinkers. More important than any individual or group we have discussed thus far, and vastly more influential, especially during the past 200 years, was another mid-seventeenth century Englishman whose political works, like those of so many of his contemporaries, were occasioned by the outbreak and trend of the Civil Wars. Thomas Hobbes' writings, beginning with *The Elements of Law, Natural and Politic*, completed in 1640, and culminating with his famous *Leviathan* of 1651, were designed to buttress absolute government. Actually his political theory—in which the defense of monarchical absolutism is relatively incidental—forms only one part of what he proposed as an all-inclusive system of philosophy founded on a basis of scientific materialism.

Among the more conspicuous strains of near-contemporary European thought which met and crossed in the Hobbesian political philosophy we find Machiavelli's brutal prescription of sheer force and unprincipled selfishness for successful government, Bodin's contention that a sovereign's monopoly of legislation should be taken as the outstanding attribute of a state, Hugo Grotius' mathematical conception of natural law, and Francis Bacon's insistence that philosophy must be inductive, experimental and utilitarian. A deist rather than an atheist, Hobbes may well have been the mephistophelean muse who whispered into Karl Marx's receptive ear that religion is the opium of the people. For, according to the British materialist, spiritual authority finds its opportunity in the weakness of the average man, with whom "the fear of darkness and ghosts is greater than other fears" and whose nerves are agitated by the threat of eternal damnation.

It scarcely needs be stated that naked Erastianism forms a vital part of Hobbes' system. Religion is of value, in his opinion, when it is employed not to challenge moral decisions of the state but simply to teach men to live in peace. In a passage of the *Leviathan* revealing as much of the author's understandable ignorance of medical science as it does his less pardonable illiteracy in theology, he declares, "For it is with the mysteries of our religion, as with wholesome pills for the sick, which swallowed whole, have the virtue to cure; but chewed, are for the most part cast up again without effect."

A church therefore is for Hobbes merely a corporation. Like any corporation it must have a head and the head is sovereign. Defining a church as "a company of men professing Christian religion, united in the person of one sovereign at whose command they ought



to assemble and without whose authority they ought not to assemble," he launches into a vigorous assault upon the traditional acceptance of a dual organization of Christian society with the impatient assertion that, "Temporal and spiritual government are but two words brought into the world to make men see double and mistake their lawful sovereign." The latter alone has the right to decide controversies in religion as he controls not, indeed, the consciences of men, but their words and actions; for he is the immediate ruler of the Church under Christ, and all other authorities are subordinate to him. Like Marsiglio of Padua, Hobbes still maintains that it is the duty of the Church to teach, but he adds that no teaching is lawful unless the sovereign authorizes it.

In words which seem to echo *The True Law of Free Monarchies*, he states that the monarch is required by God to rule well and wisely under pain of eternal punishment, and that this punishment is the affair of God, not of man. But while James I claimed impunity for lawful rulers alone, Hobbes claims it for all alike. The distinction of *de jure* and *de facto* is brushed aside. The sovereign's obligation is to keep men from cutting each other's throats (a deduction following naturally enough from his supposititious state of nature, which was a state of war and in which life was rough, tough and nasty); and that duty can be discharged as efficiently by a usurper as by the anointed descendant of a hundred kings.

Appealing to the record of history with a myopic view that may well have served as Gibbon's model in the next century, Hobbes endeavors to show that there never was a divinely instituted spiritual authority independent of the State, and that even among the Jews the secular sovereign was supreme. Since the Christian Church only obtained legal status by the gift of the emperor, he concludes with the subtle logic of an automatic stoker that its claim to supernatural authority is obviously baseless. That Hobbes' doctrines were unpopular with the majority of his contemporaries is as clear as his popularity has been with the eighteenth century rationalists and their intellectual progeny down to our current crop of totalitarians.

The Restoration era produced a few genuine thinkers on the problem of Church-State relations. The return of king and bishops seemed to terminate the question in favor of a moderate absolutism with a domineering Church under its wing. The work pioneered by Lilburne and Milton introduced a new accent in religious affairs—that of toleration for sectaries. There can be little doubt that most people of standing in Restoration England were so infected with latitudinarianism and so unconcerned about ecclesiastical matters that toleration for all but the most radical religious elements was tacitly agreed to by practically everyone except a fraction of bellicose Anglicans.

In theoretical circles Erastianism was the order of the day. Thus Jeremy Taylor shortly before his elevation to episcopal rank conceded that a bishop may excommunicate the sovereign for moral obliquity, but if the royal reprobate insists upon the administration

of the communion it must be given to him. The minders of the period followed in their predecessors' footsteps and expanded the supremacy of the king over the Church into a doctrine of complete non-resistance to the crown. The immigrant Roger L'Estrange, for example, followed Hobbes implicitly. In his words "when dissent comes to be practical it is no longer a plea of conscience, but a direct conspiracy against the government." The most interesting statesman of the period, George Saville, Earl of Halifax, defended his chameleonic political maneuvering in a pamphlet called *The Character of a Trimmer*. His attitude is typically Erastian; thus, "The consideration of religion is separated with that of government that it is never to be separated . . . There is in many, and particularly in Englishmen, a mistaken pleasure in resisting the dictates of rigorous authority."

The tactless absolutism of James II succeeding upon the diplomatic work of his less moral but more diplomatic brother eventually alienated the Establishment from the Church from the throne. Once more the Stuart monarchy was brought to the dust, this time before the noble oligarchy that engineered the so-called Glorious Revolution. Casting about in search of philosophical justification for their repudiation of the non-resistance doctrine, the new leaders invoked the aid of John Locke, an Oxford graduate, exiled for his friendship with the Whig, Shaftesbury.

Locke produced a series of letters on toleration and followed them up with two anti-absolutist pamphlets on civil government. Reviving Hooker's social compact theory, he turned it against Filmer's divine right echo of James I. Though pragmatic in a marked degree himself, he assailed the pragmatic despotism of Hobbes. Contrasts between the latter and the apologist for the aristocratic regime within the area of our discussion are even more striking. Though he had been perhaps as nearly non-religious as any man that ever lived, the author of the *Leviathan* had devoted half of his greatest work to the problem of *imperium* and *sacerdotium*. Locke, whose personal life was a distillation of the best qualities of Puritanism, was able to pass the whole question over except as it affected his argument for toleration, thus reproducing the current secularism in his attitude toward the Church.

Embryonic liberalism in its more vicious form is apparent in Locke's application of Cartesian dualism to human society. The State he defines as "a society of men constituted only for the procuring, preserving and advancing their own civil interests," and the Church as "a voluntary society of men joining themselves together of their own accord in order to worship God publicly in such a manner as they judge acceptable to Him, and effectual to the salvation of their souls." Having adopted this extreme and uncompromising conception of religious society, it was not illogical for him to conclude that

The Church itself is a thing absolutely separate and distinct from the commonwealth. The boundaries of both are fixed and immovable. He jumbles earth and heaven together, the things most remote and opposite, who mixes these two societies, which are in their origin and business and in everything distinct and infinitely different from each other.



Locke did not consider freedom of worship as strictly within the list of natural rights, nor as one of those privileges of the individual for the defense of which government is instituted. His plea for toleration rests rather on the doctrine that the State has nothing to do with the forms of worship. Here he becomes snarled in one of the many inconsistencies inherent in rationalism. Not only Independents, Arminians, Presbyterians, Anabaptists and Quakers, but even Jews, Mohammedans and pagans are rightfully entitled to the same civil privileges as those of the more orthodox manner of worship. Yet he feels obliged for strictly political considerations to exclude from the benefits of toleration these three groups: those whose opinions militate against the existence of civil society or contravene the principles of morality on which that society rests; those whose religious views allegedly subject them to a

foreign prince—referring to Catholics, of course; and atheists, since they accept no standard of morality.

Thus Locke turns the corner from an age of religious vitality into the century of deism and rationalism, marking a transition from bitter but principle conflict to a toleration born of indifference, from eternal aspirations to secular preoccupations. No problems had been solved; metaphysics was wantonly alienated from theology, and the spread of the latitudinarian spirit as a practical means of insuring peace wrecked the zealous dreams of great, or at any rate, sincere religious thinkers. The ecclesiastical Erastianism of the Stuart period gave place to the mercantile formalism of the Hanoverians. But the shouts of men who led the fierce charge of pens and fired shattering cannonades of ink, went ringing down the ages to be echoed in strange and unrecognizable forms in the years to come.

## Book Reviews

*History of the Persian Empire*, by A. T. Olmstead. Chicago. The University of Chicago Press. 1948. pp. 576, 70 plates. \$10.00

This work by the late A. T. Olmstead, published posthumously, is a splendid monument to the career of a great Oriental scholar. The author has presented a thorough, scholarly treatment of every phase of the history of the Persian Empire from the beginnings of Oriental history to the destruction of Persepolis by Alexander the Great. In addition to making exhaustive use of the Greek and Latin literary works, the writer has employed as sources a vast number of documents written in Old Persian, Akkadian, Elamite, Aramaic, Egyptian, and Hebrew, as well as recent archaeological finds. With this great wealth of sources, Olmstead was able to produce a work which, in addition to covering the political phases of Persian history, also includes extensive sections devoted to the everyday life of the people, to the laws of the various lands, to social and economic conditions, religion, art, and architecture. These sections of the work are of special interest, since, being based on more recently discovered sources, they contain material less generally known. The author was able to show, for example, by comparing many tablets recording business transactions, that a vast amount of inflation occurred during the reign of Darius. This doubtless had much to do with the eventual downfall of the Empire.

New interpretations are given to various phases of the political history. The commonly accepted view that Cambyses became insane while in Egypt, and completely alienated the Egyptian people by the cruelty he inflicted on them, is rejected by Olmstead on the basis of Egyptian documents written during the lifetime of the king and shortly thereafter. The story that Cambyses killed the Apis bull is also proved false. In fact, the Egyptian documents indicate that the king showed the utmost respect for Egyptian religion, and enjoyed a fair amount of popularity among his Egyptian subjects.

The author is inclined to discredit the story, told by Darius and Herodotus, of Cambyses' murdering his own brother, and of the subsequent seizure of the throne during Cambyses' absence in Egypt by a Magus who claimed to be the murdered brother. He thinks the person who seized the throne may well have been the brother, who, after the death of Cambyses, would have been the rightful ruler of the Empire. Darius, in his opinion, made up the story of the previous murder to conceal the fact that he was himself the usurper rather than the hero who rescued the Empire from a Magian usurper.

The Greeks are given scanty credit for their defeat of the Persians in the battles of Salamis and Plataea. On both occasions, it is argued, the Persian leaders brought defeat on themselves by yielding to a desire to win spectacular victories. Had they chosen to move slowly, they would have been almost certain of victory. Even so, Salamis was not the decisive battle it is generally regarded as having been. Mycale was actually the decisive victory of the war.

One feels that the author has allowed his enthusiasm for Persia to blind him, to some extent, to the importance of the independent Greek city states. On several occasions he remarks that the most important Greek states had been brought under Persian control before the outbreak of the Persian War, and refers to the War as an attempt ". . . to subjugate the more backward Greek states which still retained their independence" (p. 41). This characterization of the independent states as "backward" seems a little less than fair, when one takes into consideration that one of them, Athens, had already produced a Solon, sent a soldier named Aeschylus into the lines to fight the Persians, and, within less than a century, was to produce such figures as Socrates, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, and Thucydides, to name just a few.

CHAUNCEY E. FINCH.



**St. Augustine.** The Lord's Sermon on the Mount. Translated by the Very Reverend John J. Jenson, S.S. (with an introduction and notes by the editors). No. 5, Ancient Christian Writers. Westminster, Maryland, The Newman Press. 1948. \$2.75

The more of St. Augustine's work that is put into readable, modern English, the better it is for the Catholic world. That Catholic world is stirring intellectually. It has the right of inheritance to the great works of the great Catholic minds of the past. And it owes itself the introduction to this world of the spirit—to the work of the fecund and glorious intellectual giants, its elder brothers in Christ.

So we welcome this well done work of Father Jenson. The translation is smooth. The intricacies of Augustine's style are handled competently—and that is an achievement indeed, to handle competently Augustine's Latin in translation. No one, unless it be Newman, saw so many facets to every truth he handled; no one, except that same Newman, labored in such polished fashion to give just the right emphasis among the tumbling richness of thought which his pen labored so hard to express as nearly right as world could do it.

The "blurb" tells us that this work, this commentary and gloss on the Gospel at that point where the Beatitudes are reported, is a "must" for the moralist. Augustine works out in concrete illustration as well as in theoretical exposition the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount. He is teaching Catholic morality. But he is expressing the grounds on which the conclusions, the crisp directives of Catholic morality, have been reached. It is a delightful task to follow the saint as he works back and forth with Gospel text, moral principle, practical application.

Perhaps more pointedly than is his explicit practice, Augustine shows us the candor, rigid, exacting honesty of his mind—and some of its handicaps. He leaves a point or two of morality undecided, frankly acknowledging that his own lights and reason do not bring him to an exclusive conclusion. The amateur moralist will, then, find the excellent and rather numerous notes a distinct aid. In fact, the notes will be very useful to any and to every reader. Augustine's world is too remote, his illusions, his illustrations too much a part of his times, for anyone but the most expert to dispense with "notes" when reading him.

However, we must not make it appear that this book is only for the moralist. It is for anyone who would fathom more deeply the ideals which our Lord expressed when he taught the Beatitudes. It is for the advanced in spirituality. It will profit the beginners. It is one of the more immediately pertinent works of the Fathers that can start the adventurous or the striver for ideals in savoring, in delighting in the New Testament itself. And it gives a lively picture of the person of the Saint.

BAKEWELL MORRISON.

**Sacred Fortress.** *Byzantine Art and Statecraft in Ravenna*, by Otto G. von Simson. Chicago. University of Chicago Press. 1948. pp. xv, 148, 48 plates. \$10.00

The sixth century witnessed the last great attempt by the Byzantine Empire to recover western Europe and to recreate a united Roman Empire. To Justinian who inspired the great project, the objective was not only political reunion but also, and more importantly, religious unity. To him the Germanic invaders and rulers of vast tracts of the Roman Empire were, above all, heretics and therefore detestable aliens and natural enemies of his realm. Their defeat would restore not only the political unity of the Empire but also the true unity of the peoples united in one orthodox faith. To that age such spiritual union was the prerequisite of political peace. Thus, according to the author, the abiding political aspiration of Justinian was the reunion of all parts of the imperium under his sceptre through the elimination of heresy and the restoration of one undivided Christian faith.

For the attainment of his ambitions Justinian chose Ravenna as the western outpost of his empire. And since the main conflict was in the realm of religion, Justinian initiated a magnificent program of ecclesiastical architecture as "propaganda" for his political and theological concepts. These concepts were illustrated by the art and the mosaics in the churches built at his direction, with the result that the mosaics of Ravenna express the great theological and political motives of the sixth century with a force that has no parallel in Christian art. The mosaics were addressed to the people of Ravenna to whom theological doctrines and mystical experience of the liturgy had a daily meaning. Every figure, every symbol had a concrete meaning.

It is to the understanding of these symbols that the author devotes his book. In order to probe into the religious mind of the sixth century, von Simson examines minutely the contents of the three great monuments of the time, the churches of San Apollinare in Classe, San Apollinare Nuovo and San Vitale. Since these churches were the monumental expositions of Byzantine theology and thus the religious and intellectual weapons of Justinian, every mosaic is analyzed for its inner meaning. Actually the latter part of the book devolves into an exegetical analysis of symbols in general.

In order to illustrate the story the author has appended forty-eight pages of magnificent plates. Although the book will be of primary interest to the student of art, its analysis of Justinian's motives and methods will be of service to the medieval historian.

ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI.

**Austria from Hapsburg to Hitler**, by Charles A. Gulick. 2 vols. Berkeley and Los Angeles. University of California Press. 1948. pp. xxv, 1906. \$20.00

Most writers of history at least like to pretend that they are impartial in the gathering and the presentation of data on a particular subject. In the present work the author is not concerned with any such pretense, for as he himself proudly announces, his conclusions and judgments sum up a bill of indictment against the Christian Social Party and the Dollfuss-Schuschnigg governments of Austria.

The author, a member of the Economics Department



of the University of California, views the history of Austria in the post-1918 period as a struggle between democracy and Fascism and develops his thesis in two lengthy volumes. The first volume, sub-titled "Labor's Workshop of Democracy", presents a detailed account of the Social Democratic Party and of its accomplishments in the field of social and economic reform, especially in the Socialist stronghold, Vienna. Against this favorable picture of Socialist activity, Prof. Gulick contrasts the reactionary and Fascist tendencies of the Christian Social Party. Vol. II, sub-titled "Fascism's Subversion of Democracy", narrates the story of the struggle from 1927 to 1938, in which the villains are Monsignor Ignaz Seipel, "the evil genius of the Republic", Dollfuss, Starhemberg, Schuschnigg and a host of lesser figures.

Prof. Gulick contends that Austria's extinction as a nation at the hands of Hitler was not inevitable, that it could have been prevented had Chancellor Schuschnigg pursued a two-fold policy: first, a coalition with the Socialists, and secondly, by pursuing a foreign policy which would have solicited the help of democratic countries, especially of England and France. Instead, he notes, Schuschnigg chose the road toward totalitarianism and Fascism, leaving the state too weak to resist the Nazis in 1938; furthermore, the Austrian chancellor relied upon Italy, where authoritarianism was the guiding principle.

The author, however, is not consistent in the presentation of Austria's fight for survival. He himself notes that in the 1920's and early 1930's the Socialists had opposed coalition and had campaigned consistently for a majority. Bitter antagonism had grown up in this period, too bitter for the moderates of both parties to overcome. After the rise of Hitler to power and the increase of Nazi agitation, the government found itself under attack from both the right and the left. Dollfuss, and after him Schuschnigg, believed, rightly or wrongly, that Austria's only chance of survival was the abolition of all political parties and popular unity in one movement, the Fatherland Front, dedicated to the defense of Austrian independence. In this way the Nazi Party would be illegal and the resources of the small country could be mobilized against the growing Nazi menace. But in the process of consolidating its resources, the Dollfuss-Schuschnigg governments were driven further and further away from parliamentary practices and thereby alienated more completely the Socialist and moderate groups.

But even had Schuschnigg's government enjoyed unanimous domestic support, it is questionable whether Austria would have survived. In the matter of Austria's foreign orientation, Gulick is self-contradictory. He condemns Dollfuss and Schuschnigg for not drawing closer to France and England, but in commenting on Schuschnigg's policy after the fateful visit to Hitler he writes (p. 1804): "For three days after Berchtesgaden Schuschnigg had sought advice. Not even the faintest word of encouragement or support reached him from London or Paris". In view of Hitler's subsequent actions in Czecho-Slovakia, Poland, France, Belgium,

Holland, etc., the conclusion is warranted that Austria's internal policies and even her foreign alliances would not have stayed Hitler's hand for long.

Had the author been able to divorce himself from his preconceptions, his voluminous work would have been a major contribution to the understanding of how emasculated Austria attempted to solve its economic and social problems. As a social and economic study it would have been noteworthy. But when Prof. Gulick attempts to expand his work into a full-scale history of Austria in the post-war period he falls far short of his mark. Although Austria's position in Europe cannot be evaluated without a knowledge of the changing diplomatic situations, the author devotes a minimum of space to foreign affairs, and even where mention is made, no proper evaluation for effect on Austria is attempted.

Underscoring the method pursued in the presentation of his thesis is the source of material utilized. It is evident that chief reliance was upon Social Democratic sources and upon newspapers and magazine items which support his contentions. He takes great pains to reflight every conflict in which the Social Democrats were involved and ordinarily concludes that the Socialist position was the correct one. At times Prof. Gulick seems to go out of his way to heap condemnations upon Dollfuss and Schuschnigg. He is especially irked by the sympathy, which he considers misplaced and unjustified, for the memory of Dollfuss and for the person of Schuschnigg in this country. His task is to prove that the sympathy is unjustified. In this two volume of "bill of indictment" he is rather a prosecutor than an impartial judge trying to present a detached summation of facts as he has unearthed them.

ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI.

*A Modern Law of Nations—An Introduction*, by Philip C. Jessup. New York. The Macmillan Company. 1948. pp. xii, 236. \$4.00

The Hamilton Fish Professor of International Law and Diplomacy at Columbia University calls in his latest book for "the systematic re-examination of the traditional body of international law" (Preface p. vii) and himself begins this task in the present work which he calls an introduction and which gives reason to expect a continuation of these efforts. The book is based on two hypotheses which the author has "singled out as keystones of a revised international legal order" (p. 2). The first is "that international law, like national law, must be directly applicable to the individual" (p. 2). The second is the concept of "community interest in the prevention of breaches of international law" (p. 12). The adoption of the two hypotheses is basic to a modernization of the law of nations. With this aim in view, the attempt is made throughout the book "to distinguish between the existing law and the future goals of the law" (p. 91). According to the existing system international law "is a law only between states, not between individuals or between individuals and states" (p. 8). "For the purposes of this context . . . international law or the law of nations



must be defined as law applicable to states in their mutual relations and to individuals in their relations with states" (p. 17).

The book opens new vistas of the subject as a whole. The author does not maintain that the two principles are generally accepted yet, but he presents a wealth of material as proof of definite trends in regard to these basic assumptions. As to the recognition of the individual in international law, the author discusses such topics as piracy, treatment of aliens, war criminals, and respect for human rights. Turning to the second hypothesis of community interest, Professor Jessup opens his attack with the statement: "The most dramatic weakness of traditional international law has been its admission that a state may use force to compel compliance with its will" (p. 157). He shows convincingly how the Covenant of the League of Nations (Article 11) made "any war or threat of war" a matter of community interest and how the Charter of the United Nations expanded upon this principle. The author remains, however, well aware of the weaknesses of the present system.

In the light of the two basic assumptions the author examines under both existing law (*lex lata*) and future international law (*de lege ferenda*) such problems and topics as the subjects of a modern law of nations, recognition of states and governments and of insurgents and belligerents, nationality and the rights of man, the responsibility of states for injuries to individuals, international agreements, the legal regulation of the use of force, and rights and duties in case of illegal use of force. Space does not permit us to do more than to mention the leading topics of the book. It contains also many interesting and stimulating expositions on such widely discussed concepts as sovereignty, equality, independence and interdependence, intervention and self-defense.

On the whole, the book is a pioneering study of outstanding value upon which the author himself as well as others will be able to expand. For the development of international law Professor Jessup has shown the direction by his advice to utilize "the experience of the past [three] centuries, reviewed in the light of new concepts" (p. 14).

HERBERT WEINSCHEL.

*National Self-Determination*, by Alfred Cobban. Chicago. The University of Chicago Press. 1948. pp. xvi, 186. \$3.00

Dr. Cobban of the faculty of history in the University of London has made an historical, analytical and philosophical study of the doctrine of self-determination, which was first published in the United Kingdom by Oxford University Press in 1944. In 1948 The University of Chicago Press brought out an American Edition of this book under the label "Second Impression, Revised Edition," in which the revision is limited mainly to a new "Preface to American Edition" (pp. vii-xii), while "apart from a number of small alterations . . . especially in the form of changes of tense from present and future to past . . . the book remains substantially unchanged" (Preface, p. vii).

The author justifies this procedure by saying that the book "was not intended to be a study of the transient phases of a rapidly changing balance of power, but an analysis of a basic element in modern international system . . ." (Preface p. vii). We still think that the publication of an edition, labeled as revised, should have required the incorporation and evaluation in the text itself of the important events and developments in and outside of Europe that have taken place since the completion of the first edition, instead of using the form of brief references to those events in the new preface, a procedure adopted by the author. That means that we have to do basically with the book as it was published a few years ago; it received generally favorable comment in periodicals at that time. We can, therefore, limit ourselves here to a presentation of the main approach to his subject and of the leading ideas, as offered by the author.

Dr. Cobban points out that self-determination is a recent term for "the right of national independence" and defines it as "the belief that each nation has a right to constitute an independent state and determine its own government" (p. 4). He traces the development of this doctrine in recent history and analyzes its functioning since the First World War. He shows how the principle of self-determination formed the foundation of the peace-settlement following that war and how this principle proved inapplicable in fact. As a result he sees the need for a complete re-examination of the doctrine and its philosophy, a task which he undertakes in the present book. In his scholarly analysis he explores the whole problem of self-determination from various angles in its manifestations in Europe, Africa and Asia, including an investigation of the solutions attempted by the British Commonwealth of Nations, the United States, and the Soviet Union.

On the basis of this examination he arrives at the following main conclusions: The failure of self-determination in practice cannot lead to a demand for the abolition of small states. The strength of national feeling must be taken into account. On the other hand, the right of self-determination cannot mean an absolute right to independent statehood. Regional autonomy—short of political independence—must be considered sufficient for small national groups. The principle of the modern nation-state leads both to national and to international disaster. "The multi-national state"—not like the autocratic Austrian and Ottoman Empires of the past, but like the democratic states Great Britain, Canada, Belgium and Switzerland—"must be accepted among the possible and legitimate forms of political organization" (p. 63). The smaller nations or states are dependent economically on the policies of the great world powers, not by the fiat of the great powers, but by sheer force of circumstances, and this dependence is more absolute now than ever before. The co-operation between great and small powers is the solution. The great powers must accept the responsibility for peace and economic progress without imposing domination upon the smaller states.

A careful reading of the book reveals a number of



consistencies and gives the impression that it has been written in an idealistic vein, with eye closed to political realities and the expectation from the great powers of an unselfish attitude such as the world has not experienced in recent history. Can dependence of small states be reconciled with the postulate of full equality of rights of those very states with the great powers on whom the former are more dependent now than ever before? There arise also other difficulties with regard to implementation: Where should the line be drawn between those nations that should be recognized as independent states and those others which should receive only a degree of regional autonomy? The author says that this is determined by "circumstances" (cf. pp. 74, 178, 182) or "traditions" (cf. p. 178). He places "the Belgians or the Swiss, the Turks or the Mexicans" (p. 174) in the first category. On the other hand, "Catalonia, for example, cannot be other than part of Spain, Wales of Great Britain, or the Ukraine of Russia" (p. 178).

Already this criticism suggests that Dr. Cobban does not offer the final solution for the problem of nationalism and the survival of small nations. At the same time it must be recognized that the present study has filled a real need with its penetrating analysis of the doctrine of self-determination which "is not the whole problem of world peace, but it is a very important part of it" (Preface p. xii). The author has thereby made a permanent contribution to the clarification of this important subject and hence to general field of international relations.

HERBERT WEINSCHEL.

*Rebel Raider, Raphael Semmes's Cruise in the C. S. S. Sumter*, by Harpur Allen Gosnell, Chapel Hill. University of North Carolina Press. 1948. pp. vii, 218. \$3.75

Raphael Semmes is, naturally, best known to most students of history as the commander of that highly efficient and effective Confederate privateer, the *Alabama*, which wrought havoc with the shipping of the North during the Civil War.

Less well known is the career of Captain Semmes in the predecessor of the *Alabama*, the *Sumter*, from June of 1861 to April of 1862. Now that story, less important but perhaps no less interesting, is related in *Rebel Raider*.

This episode, as here related, has several points of interest to the historian as well as to other readers. In addition to presenting a rather inclusive picture of a privateer in action, it gives much incidental information on prize law, international admiralty regulations, and the confused diplomatic situation of the early Civil War days.

More than this, the book gives much insight into Raphael Semmes himself. Semmes was a man of education and literary ability; *Rebel Raider* is actually a section of Semmes' *Memoirs*, edited only so as to make smoothly flowing narrative.

Interpolated in this narrative are the editor's excellent commentaries on certain points arising out of Semmes' story. Mr. Gosnell, a member of the United States

Naval Reserve for many years and an authority in the field of international law, is well qualified to furnish these amplifications which round out an interesting and well-balanced picture.

J. W. CROSS, JR.

*General Gage in America, Being Principally a History of His Role in the American Revolution*, by John Richard Alden. Baton Rouge. Louisiana State University Press. 1948. pp. xi, 313. \$4.00

This volume presents something of a problem to a reviewer for a historical journal. Were it not for the author's modesty and open admissions that it is an incomplete piece of work, criticism of the result would be easy.

To the credit of the author and of the book, certain things should be listed. The study is the first made of General Gage, a figure of no small importance in the pre-Revolutionary period and certainly worthy of treatment by an historian. On this score Mr. Alden is breaking new ground. Further, this new ground to be broken seems to have lost most of its subsoil, as Mr. Alden's plowing seems to have brought up remarkably little in the way of source material. This defect would not seem to be the result of a lack of diligence on the author's part, as he seems to have searched well.

The result of Mr. Alden's work has been, then, a rather superficial treatment of General Gage. So much of this superficiality as is due to a lack of materials may be excusable. Less defensible is the type of writing which the author has done, a type of writing sometimes described as "precious." There is, in the opinion of this reviewer, too much of the conjectural in certain conclusions. The use of such phrases as "must have," "no doubt," and "likely" preceding statements in the text leaves room for doubt as to the validity of the statements themselves. This style is acceptable in a volume for the general reader, but is somewhat lacking in acceptability for the historian.

However, this volume has merit and, as a preliminary study of General Gage, historical value. It is to be hoped that the author will be able to uncover additional documents and material with which to amplify his work.

J. W. CROSS, JR.

*Grass Roots History*, by Theodore C. Blegen. Minneapolis. University of Minnesota Press. 1947. pp. x, 266. \$3.00

Theodore Blegen cherishes a dream of something better in historical research — the hope of drawing a sharper etching of the national scene by the meticulous, sympathetic, exciting unearthing of the story of a region in terms of its common work-a-day life. His philosophy: "the pivot of history is not the uncommon, but the usual, and the true makers of history are 'the people yes'." His intellectual discovery: that a given American region may contain in itself "the memory of everything America has been, and the knowledge of what it may become, each region chanting its own chant with one voice and out of them all a chorus rising and blending until with Whitman 'We hear the voice of America singing'."



Professor Blegen is dean of the graduate school at the University of Minnesota. A lifetime of research has made him an authority on the frontier history of the Upper Mississippi Valley with special emphasis on his home state, Minnesota. *Grass Roots History* is compiled of materials originally organized for publication as articles or for delivery as lectures over a period of years.

Prodding his way into the story of early pioneer beginnings—into “the days of small things,” Blegen unearths fascinating sources from which he pieces together his grass roots story: letters Norwegian immigrants sent to their homeland, preserved by families to fall eventually into the hands of a historian; diaries with painstaking entries at the end of a farmer’s day; the very revealing notes made by the minister’s wife as she accompanied her husband on parish calls.

The author is at his best when he writes of pioneer folkways—traditions of hospitality, observance of holidays with their social and religious customs transplanted from the homeland, life as it was lived day by day in the transition of the bewildered immigrant to the established American. Professor Blegen’s book is a work to be relished slowly, definitely not literary fare to be gulped, if you would feel the slow, sure, putting out of roots social, political and domestic of a rugged people in a new land; if you would know a growing nostalgia for snugly founded Norwegian communities and Kvindeforening (Ladies Aid to you) on Thursday afternoons.

MILO J. MCGINLEY.

*A New Assisi*, by Sister Mary Eunice Hanousek, O.S.F. Milwaukee. Bruce. 1948. pp. xiv, 231. \$5.00

An old Spanish proverb has it that “even with crooked lines God knows how to write straight.” The turmoil in Europe during the stormy year of 1848 supplied some of the crooked lines with which Divine Providence began writing an inspiring chapter in the history of the Church’s development in the United States. On the occasion of the revolutions of that year, and moved by zeal to spread the Kingdom of Christ in the mission land of North America, a group of Tertiary Brothers and Sisters was organized at Ettenbeuren, Bavaria. From this group was to develop the future congregation of the Sisters of St. Francis of Assisi in America. Their hundred years’ story is the theme of this book, ably chronicled by an historian from among their ranks.

These Franciscan Tertiaries, twelve in number, offered their services to Bishop Henni of Milwaukee who was touring Europe at the time, seeking recruits for his diocese. “I consider this idea,” wrote the zealous prelate, “as a sign of divine providence for my poor diocese. May this plan become a reality and help me to carry out one of my ardently longed-for wishes” (p. 9). On May 28, 1849, the plan began to be realized: the pioneers crossed the Atlantic and presented themselves to Bishop Henni at his episcopal residence in Milwaukee, after which they settled at Nojoshing, the present township of St. Francis and site of the mother-

house. There the foundations were laid for the congregation’s future works of apostolic zeal. Though shaken by many a storm in the early years, the edifice has remained, in the form of numerous schools and orphanages—a monument to the spirit of St. Francis. Sister Eunice here tells a stirring story of one hundred years that are an inspiration to an age sadly in need of the Christian leaven.

ROBERT G. GASSERT.

*The Man in the Street: The Impact of American Public Opinion on Foreign Policy*, by Thomas A. Bailey. New York. Macmillan. 1948. pp. 334. \$5.00

Thomas A. Bailey has as his first love diplomatic history and, indeed, is probably best known for his text, *Diplomatic History of the American People* (1940). In *The Man in the Street*, Bailey enters what seems to be a new field—that of public opinion on our foreign policy. Sufficient reconsideration, though, will bring out to those who know Bailey’s *Diplomatic History* that the public opinion field is not entirely new to him, since he included in that volume much more on opinion of foreign affairs by the public press and by individual citizens than most writers on diplomatic history have done. Thus, Bailey’s “new field” actually contains some “old sod,” over which Bailey has already stridden. In short, he is on rather familiar ground.

At the outset, Bailey pleads the cause of the importance of public opinion on the conduct of public affairs in general and foreign affairs in particular. Throughout, his tone is consistent with John Stuart Mill’s remark, “In politics it is almost a triviality to say that public opinion now rules the world.” Almost as determined as Jean Jacques himself, he argues in Rousseauian vein for the importance of “The Sovereign Citizen”—which significantly is the title of the first chapter.

Quite logically Bailey takes not a chronological but rather a topical approach to his subject. He seeks to analyze certain phases of our historical foreign policy and then attempts to compile events which give weight to the underlying thesis that our international relations are largely determined by public opinion; that the executive and congressional “powers that be” can not act in a manner insensitive to the feelings of John Q. Public.

Bailey includes among topics considered: Isolationism, Dollar Diplomacy, Monroeism, Sectionalism and Hyphenated-Americans as well as many sub-topics. Some of these points are incontrovertible; others—seen through the spectacles of Professor Bailey—represent a personalized interpretation. All readers may not see eye-to-eye with Bailey, but they surely will find many things that are stimulating in his work. At least, the present reviewer has found more stimulants than irritants therein.

The author presents a rather strong case for the importance of public opinion on international affairs, though there probably will be some readers who remain “unconvinced still” at least on certain details connected



th the thesis. In any event, Bailey writes in a quite readable style, and it is most refreshing to history-minded people to read a historian's analysis of public opinion on historical affairs, as against mere surveys of statistics-centered poll-takers.

CLIFFORD REUTTER.

*Depression Decade: From New Era Through New Deal 1929-1941*, by Broadus Mitchell. "The Economic History of the United States." Vol. IX. New York. Rinehart and Co. 1947. pp. xviii, 462. Text \$4.00, trade, \$5.50

In this, the third volume to be issued in "The Economic History of the United States," the series plunges boldly into the field of recent history. For the proximity of the events, Dr. Mitchell has preserved an admirable balance. Recognition is everywhere of the debt of the New Deal to the preceding administration; indeed, if Dr. Mitchell may be said to have a thesis, a part of it is that the popularity of the Democratic regime rested less on the novelty and efficacy of the expedients devised than on the confident verve with which they were administered. For, Roosevelt and his followers were "grandly opportunistic" and did not hesitate to reverse their course if a program failed to bring the desired results. It was this characteristic which made palatable the program of crop destruction while many went hungry, and maintained the President's enthusiastic following whether the policy was collusion or collision with big business. The ultimate failure of the New Deal, the session of 1937 and the fact that there were still a million unemployed in 1940, are implicitly attributed to a loss of this confidence and fertility of expedients. Another recurrent theme is that "despite efforts—Hoover's orthodoxy tempered with boldness, and Roosevelt's boldness mixed with orthodoxy—the nation did not emerge from the decade of depression until pulled out by war orders from abroad and the defense program at home. (p. 368f.) 'Plans which began so buoyantly for 'the more abundant life' and the dignity of man ended in 'total war'." (p. 127.)

The onset of the depression and the efforts of the Hoover administration are judiciously summarized, but most of the space is rightly allocated to the six years between the accession of President Roosevelt and the beginning of World War II. The matter is treated typically through this span, two chapters being devoted to finance, one each to agriculture, the N. R. A., labor, public works, the T. V. A. and reciprocal trade; a final chapter is a description of the impact of the war. The volume is concluded with a chapter on "The Literature of the Subject." The book on the whole is well written although there is somewhat of an excess of figures unrelieved by explanatory charts or graphs; these have been relegated to the appendix. The author has been able to include within the relatively brief space of the book an amazing amount of matter, and the coverage is both extensive and exhaustive, ranging from the admirable introduction, "World Economy Between Wars," and the excellent resumes

of the Roosevelt era on pages 365-370 and the "Summary" to such minutiae as comparison of regional differentials in wages under both W. P. A. and N. Y. A. Certainly this volume will be a welcome addition to the library of many a student of history; it should prove well-nigh invaluable to the teacher.

R. W. McCLUGGAGE.

*The Army Air Forces in World War II*, Vol. 1, Plans and Early Operations, January 1939 to August 1942, by Office of Air Force History. Chicago. University of Chicago Press. 1948. pp. xxxi, 788. \$5.00

The casual reader can be well warned by the style of lettering employed upon this book's dust jacket—the strictly functional type that has commonly marked AAF equipment. For in it he will find none of the glamor or romance associated with flying in general and the Air Force in particular; it does not attempt to supplement Hollywood's war and post-war effort, press accounts, or individual unit histories. This first volume of the projected "Seven Volume History" prepared by the Office of Air Force History is as unadorned, businesslike, and effective of purpose as the planes which made the history it narrates. The reader who attempts to read the book merely for its "cream," i. e., actual combat history, will be soon snarled and confused by a formidable welter of code names, abbreviations, officers, and bases which are incidental to the operational and administrative history of the Force. While he could be selective in his reading, his effort would be better rewarded by consultation of the more reliable aviation periodicals and service journals.

The student and interested citizen, on the other hand, have the unparalleled opportunity of reading history recorded "while it is still hot," of consulting a record which was prepared by an impressive array of competent and trained historians making use of the active files of the AAF, so that in many instances the event could almost have been said to have been recorded while it was still in progress. It is not an official government publication as the word is commonly understood, but the only element of such a publication that it really does lack is the title of government subscription. For it is by far the most authoritative work on the subject that is likely to be published within the next few years. Many books will be doubtlessly written on our aerial war, but there will be very few that will not be gauged ultimately by this series.

For the most part the book is as terse and impersonal as a communiqué—there is no attempt to minimize or excuse failures of strategy or tactics, men or planes; there are no heroes or villains; no flag-waving or condemnations. Events touching the lives of millions of Americans alive today are treated with the distance with which the Crusades or English Civil War are set down in modern books. The few flecks of humor—the "battles" of Borinquen Field and Los Angeles—serve only to point up the general tenor of the period in which "snafu," "tarfu," and "fubar" became established parts of American war jargon. Like the war it narrates, there



is nothing entertaining in this book, but there is masterfully prepared information drawn from the most reliable sources.

Volume 1, by chapter headings, deals with: The Air Service in World War I; The Army Air Arm Between Two Wars, 1919-39; Air War, 1939-41; The Air Corps Prepares for War, 1939-41; Deployment on the Eve of Hostilities; Pearl Harbor and Clark Field; Establishment of the Fundamental Bases of Strategy; Air Defense of the Western Hemisphere; The Early Development of Air Transport and Ferrying; Loss of the Netherlands East Indies; The Defense of Australia; Drawing the Battle Line in the Pacific; The Problem of New Guinea; Commitments to China; The AAF in the Battle of the Atlantic; Plans, Policies and Organization (in preparation against Germany); Establishment of the Eighth Air Force in the United Kingdom; Rouen-Sottesville No. 1, 17 August 1942.

The treatment of the above topics is necessarily compact and precise, but in most cases practically all essential information upon the more important events within their scope has been presented and documented, or sources of the information have been indicated.

Photographs and maps, none of them purely decorative, provide excellent illustration of the text. Footnotes, appendices, glossary, and index contribute their share towards making the book a first class, high priority tool of historical research.

The Air Force personnel and those others who assisted in the preparation of this work can be assured they have prepared a fitting memorial of those to whom the book is dedicated—to those of the AAF who did not come back.

JOHN J. DAHLHEIMER.

*Liberty Against Government: the Rise, Flowering and Decline of a Famous Judicial Concept*, by Edward S. Corwin. Baton Rouge. Louisiana State University Press. 1948. pp. xiii, 198. \$3.00

It is important to notice at once that Mr. Corwin is not writing the obituary of liberty in general, but only of a particular conception of liberty. The memorial service is only for that notion of liberty which is basically individualistic and liberalistic, which thinks of government as its foremost antagonist and uses law only as a protective shield. In a word, the corpse is *laissez faire*.

Today a more vital conception of liberty is gaining ground; one that is based on social and economic equalitarianism and looks to government and law for its fulfillment. As a consequence, judicial review—"the citadel of American constitutionalism," to quote the author—is undergoing a revolution and constriction at the hands of an expanding police power. How all this has come about, Mr. Corwin endeavors to show in relatively few pages.

He begins the life story of "judicial" liberty by tracing its development from Stoic origins, down through John of Salisbury, Sir Edward Coke, James Otis, Locke, and a host of others, to its triumphant achievement in the American institution of judicial review.

These triumphs were incorporated in a "doctrine of vested rights" and securely anchored to the "due process" clause of the Fifth Amendment. In time, "due process" changed from a purely adjectival norm to a substantial limitation on the legislative power. This limitation in turn has been considerably weakened by the New Deal philosophy. The legalistic sources of these changes, therefore, forms the principal theme of the book.

Essentially involved in the narrative is the analysis of the leading cases arising out of the Fourteenth Amendment, the judicial prejudice favoring property rights, and the mounting demand for the recognition of public interests. The evolution is understandably complicated, but Mr. Corwin has presented the matter in an easily intelligible form. The only question it leaves unsatisfactorily answered is whether or not it regrets the demise.

PAUL A. WOELFL.

## Book Notices

### *Select Problems in Historical Interpretation—*

I. *Ideas and Institutions in European History 800-1715*, pp. xiii, 369. \$2.75

II. *The Quest for a Principle of Authority in Europe, 1715-Present*, by Thomas C. Mendenhall, Basil D. Henning and A. S. Foord. New York. Henry Holt and Company. 1948. pp. xiii, 376. \$2.75

These are "work books" in history, designed by the authors for use in the freshman survey course of the college level. Their purpose is to make the student his own historian, to some extent at least, by presenting him collections of documents centering around selected "problems."

The subjects are well chosen, and the result is two volumes of readings covering medieval and modern European history. Whether this work can serve as more than two volumes of reading depends on how many instructors believe with the authors that it is necessary to work out "problems" in order to maintain student interest in the subject. Whatever the instructor's approach, he will find available here—and at a reasonable price for once!—a valuable collection of readings for his own profit as well as his students'.

T. P. N.

*The World Since 1914*, by Walter Consuelo Langsam. Sixth edition. New York. The Macmillan Company. 1948. pp. xviii, 969. \$5.50

This is a new edition of a text popular since its first publication in 1933. The only major change made since the last edition of 1943 is the addition of four chapters to complete the coverage of the recent war and its aftermath. In all other respects it remains the same useful survey that has been popular for more than a decade.

D. J. R.